

## UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the United States Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alfred C. Holmes to be an ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there are so few Senators in the Chamber at the present time—

Mr. MYERS. These are routine nominations, and under our standing agreement we are not asking that the President be notified. Therefore, they will stand open until the next executive session.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

## RECESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 25 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

## IN THE NAVY

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Alice E. Applegate et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 12, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the Senate for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Alice E. Applegate, which appears on page 6997, and ending with the name of Joseph H. Benton, which appears on page 7083.

The following-named midshipmen (Aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the page 6999.

Albert L. Abdon	Daniel E. Gillis
Warren J. Ackerman	Arthur W. Goudey
Henry G. Bailey	Carl A. Gray
Franklin H. Barker	William A. Gregg IV
Robert J. Basso	Donald F. Guertin
Fred J. Bellar, Jr.	William A. Gureck
Lawrence W. Burns, Jr.	John A. Hershel
Dale E. Campbell	Herbert Q. Himes
Donald D. Casson	Delbert D. Hofferth
Robert J. Ceremask	Bruce P. Hoffman
Robert D. Connolly	Paul I. Hunter
Phillip L. Dafford	Selmer O. Iverson
Lawrence C. Day	Benjamin F. James, Jr.
Robert F. Dreesen	Daniel C. Johnson
Lawrence F. Emigholz	Homer R. Johnson
John O. England	Donald E. Kell
George A. Finke	John W. Kelly
Francis L. Fleming	Bruce R. King, Jr.
Thomas D. Fritsch	Ben P. Kingsbury
Howard E. Furgalack	Darrell F. Kirkpatrick
Thomas R. Galley	Charles P. Lamb, Jr.

Henry C. LaFaro	John A. Schaefer
Robert LeR. Lawrence	Harry G. Simmerman
Paul W. Leinbach	Jack D. Sirrine
Arthur H. Leonard, Jr.	Daniel J. Silwinski
William J. Leonard	Jerome W. Smith
Philip A. Lord	Robert W. Sommer
Donald M. Lynam	Robert S. Stallings
Timothy J. McMahon	David O. Story
William J. Maier, Jr.	Paul R. Streich
Russell A. Marcellus	David T. Styles
Billy W. Matthews	Gerald S. Talley
Phillip A. May	John R. Thomson
Joseph Meachum	Ronald G. Tinlin
Robert D. Metzger	Richard A. Trethric
Carl H. Molling	Ralph M. Tvede, Jr.
Ralph C. Nash, Jr.	Lawrence T. Vance
Robert A. O'Connor, Jr.	William B. Warwick
Valfrid E. Palmer	Glenn L. Wegner
Engelbert G. Pezzel	Ronald B. West
William B. Pruitt	Donald R. Wilson
Abram H. Quackenbush	James K. Wilson
Carmelo C. Restuccia	Don L. Wuethrich
Carl W. Rochester	James C. Youngblood
Roger E. Ruch	Donald R. Zachary
	Charles H. Zilch

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Roderick E. Jensen  
Peter R. Kuhl

Maurice G. Duncan (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950 in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps as previously nominated and confirmed.

Peter C. Conglis (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert E. Austin William L. Robinhold  
Marx R. Budden Paul E. Zeigler  
Frederick J. Finnegan

"J" T. Walmsley, Jr. (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950 in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name.

Philip W. K. Sweet, Jr. (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps), to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950 in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

## UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

## To be lieutenants

William Walter Richter  
John Andrew Corso  
William Henry St. George  
George Thomas Trefts  
Robert Justice Bloxson

## To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Nathaniel Foote Main  
Edwin Allen Schmidt  
Roger Harry Swain  
Robert Daniel Valentine  
Edgar Stanley Carlson  
Vincent Joseph Mitchell  
Richard Taylor Houlette  
Andrew Stefan Skucy  
Ross Lynn Moore  
Walter Edward Johnson  
Benjamin Franklin Rush  
Thomas Comfort Duncan, Jr.  
Adam Stanley Zabinski  
William James Brasler

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Alfred C. Holmes to be an ensign, effective May 25, 1950.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art high and holy and who hast respect unto the lowly and the humble, we pray that daily our spirits may be brought into tune with Thy spirit and that our wills may be obedient to Thy divine will, for our wills are ours to make them Thine.

Grant that we may go forth to meet the duties and opportunities of this new day inspired and sustained by an unflinching faith in Thee, a greater faith in humanity, a stronger faith in the adequacy of our moral and spiritual resources, and a more confident faith in the promise and the assurance that a better day is dawning for ourselves and all mankind.

May our souls be kindled with the enthusiasm of high ideals and with a vision of glorious enterprises and undertakings. Fill us with a longing to gain for others the blessings which we ask and seek for ourselves. May we be mindful of the eternal truth that having received any blessing from Thee makes us debtors to all Thy needy children.

In Christ's name may we give Thee all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE—FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID TO STATES AND COMMUNITIES MAINTAINING RECREATION DAY CENTERS FOR OLDER PERSONS IS URGENTLY NEEDED

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the presence in our midst of an increasing proportion of old persons in the population of this Nation is a familiar fact. In 1920, 4.7 percent of the Nation's population consisted of persons 65 years and over. This proportion had risen to 7.4 percent in 1947 and is expected to reach 10.8 percent in 1975, and 13.2 percent in the year 2000.

Today there are about 10,500,000 men and women in this age group. By the year 2000 it is expected that there will be 22,000,000.

Out of ten-million-and-odd men and women above the age of 65, almost 60 percent either depend upon their children or upon the community for support, according to the figures of the Social Security Board. Our aged population has increased tremendously but the services to the aged have not kept up in proportion to the increase. In the city of

New York, for example, where there are more than one-half million people over 65, provision has been made for only some 11,500 in homes for the aged. Hundreds of older people are on waiting lists in many of the homes for the aged, and even if the capacity was doubled by building more and larger institutions, the growing needs of the older persons would still not be met.

Mr. Speaker, a number of experts in the social-welfare field, who view the problems of old age as basically problems of human conservation, have recommended that many of the old-age homes should be turned into nursing homes; that the ambulatory person should be encouraged to remain in the community as long as he possibly can; and that provision should be made for the older person in the community to keep him active and have him participate in community programs. To the extent possible, older persons should be kept away from old-age homes, away from clinics and hospitals, and particularly out of mental institutions where the present admissions of people over 65 are staggering and completely in contradiction to the known facts in the field of gerontology.

The older persons are in urgent need of acceptance, relationship, encouragement, and active participation in the life around them. The establishment and maintenance in the communities of recreation day centers for persons 65 years of age and over is more important for the wholesale development and preservation of their personality than all of the institutions that could be built, without denying the need for them. The cost is negligible and the savings in terms of prolongation of the usefulness of the individual and of releasing pressure from hospital clinics, mental institutions, and homes for the aged are tremendous.

Centers providing recreation facilities for older persons have successfully been maintained in many communities located in such cities as New York, Philadelphia, and Cleveland. Last May, at the annual hobby show for older persons organized by the welfare council of New York City, 1,000 oldsters, 100 of whom were more than 80 years old, participated by exhibiting models, sculptures, paintings, needlecraft, metal works, leathercraft, and a host of other arts and unusual collections. One of the most active of the 45 groups in the show was the William Hodson Community Center. Located in the Bronx of the city of New York, it is the oldest of six similar centers now operated jointly by the city department of welfare, settlement houses, churches, welfare agencies, and other local neighborhood groups. It was started in 1943 by the welfare department, which realized the need of older persons for some activity to replace the loss of the workday.

Originally open only a few hours each day, the center now operates from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. daily, and on Saturday afternoons, when the program is devoted to movies and dancing. The members administer the center's activities through self-government. During the week they

paint, work at arts and crafts, visit—which is a major activity—edit their mimeographed magazine, and plan their monthly birthday parties and entertainments. In addition to a birthday party, each member also gets a birthday card, often the first such remembrance that many have received in years. The members also prepare coffee, tea, and cake, which are served at noon each day. Some bring sandwiches for their noon-day lunch, but others prefer to eat a late breakfast so that they can spend their entire day at the center. The center also has a visiting committee, which calls on members who are sick at home or who are hospitalized. Sickness rates, however, are unusually low for such an advanced age group.

The building that houses the center is old and crowded. It is poorly furnished, in need of redecoration, and contains a minimum of equipment. The total budget is less than \$20,000 a year. But shining out of the drab surroundings are the faces and spirits of the members who are gay and happy, for they have found companionship in a place that is their own. Many say that since coming to the center they are really enjoying the best years of their lives.

Although a person need be only 60 years old to join the center, most members are in their seventies or eighties, with many in their nineties. The average membership age is 74. There are 450 active members, most of whom visit the center several times weekly, and many of whom come daily. What the center means to its members was expressed by a 93-year-old former telegrapher, who had been living in a furnished room for several years and visiting the center daily. About a year ago he was moved to an old-age home, the authorities of which permit him to go to the center only once a week. He said: "Now I spend my week just looking forward to Monday and a chance to see my friends. The other days of the week I have nothing to do but sit."

From their experience at the Hodson and other centers, Raymond Hilliard, New York City commissioner of welfare, and his staff, believe the problems of the aged can best be met by recipients of old-age assistance living in boarding homes and rooms, and attending day community centers. They point out that such a system is not only more economical, but that it gives the aged persons the advantages of group activity and companionship. The Hodson Community Center has demonstrated that with such programs the need for hospitalization and nursing care can be reduced, dependency lessened, and the aged person can continue to live a useful, dignified, and self-respecting life. For example, despite the large number of aged persons who are committed to mental hospitals, in the 6-year history of the Hodson center during which they had more than 700 members, not a single member has ever been admitted to such an institution. City welfare officials contend that recreation and group activity are just as essential to the older person as food, clothing, and shelter. With its preventive aspects, the Hodson center not

only saves lives, but dollars. It adds life to the years as well as years to life.

In Philadelphia where recreation projects have been in effect since 1943 and where some 1,534 people over 65 years of age met almost every week in 42 recreation clubs in 1948, experience showed that fear and shame of being old can change to pride through happy group experiences. In a group, older people tend to be tolerant, cooperative, patient, mellow, appreciative, while many of their negative attitudes, practiced as individuals, tend to disappear. The death rate among club members in their seventies and eighties seemed unexpectedly low. They seemed to live longer with something pleasant to look forward to, with new friends and a new social life. They undertook new pursuits of happiness with enthusiasm and satisfaction. Many of them learned new attitudes as well as new hobbies, which often offered the oldsters a chance to realize some cherished dream.

"Why waste money on the old folks? They are going to die soon anyway." This statement reflects an attitude quite prevalent until recently and not yet banished completely from the thinking of substantial numbers of our people. The brutal idea that the elderly are economic liabilities and should be treated like antiquated machinery—discarded, junked, undeserving of any substantial outlays to extend their usefulness—must be obliterated from our social conscience. Unless society takes effective and prompt steps now to open up new opportunities for our elderly, we shall see a mighty upsurge of panacea clubs such as the Townsend plan and the "ham and eggs," which threatened to sweep the country during the depression, and we shall be inviting demagogues to ride to power on the frail backs of the elderly.

Among the healthy and infirm, the poor and the wealthy, the secure and the insecure, old age without occupation is not only tedious but dangerous. Our constant urge to keep busy, which is shared by young and old alike, can be met to a great extent through recreation and social contacts. The elderly need the satisfaction that comes from doing things, and from meeting people who have similar interests and problems. Physicians inform us that many an oldster has died before his time simply because he became bored "killing time," could not bear idleness, and found no reason to live. The aging need recreation just as much as younger folks do to keep their lives from shriveling up and to keep them mentally and physically active.

Mr. Speaker, recreation centers for old folks will, in my considered judgment, prove a life-saving program. In order to encourage the establishment and maintenance of these centers in every American community, financial assistance from the Federal Government is urgently needed now. Recreational programs for the elderly are now under way in many cities in New York State, in Los Angeles, in Minneapolis, in Detroit, and in St. Petersburg, Fla. The adoption by the Federal Government of a policy of subsidizing these wholesome community ef-



forts to provide adequate recreation centers for older persons will fulfill the great American tradition—a chance to be free human beings, living with dignity and respect.

I am therefore today introducing a bill which has for its purpose the implementation of these programs instituted in the several States, calling upon the Federal Government to provide financial assistance in establishing and maintaining recreation day centers for older persons. This bill calls for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to assist the States in this worthy undertaking. I hope it will have the approval of the committee to which it is referred, and that it will eventually pass this House.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Wildlife and Fisheries of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next, and that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNISTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when the majority whip this morning asked permission for a subcommittee to sit while the House is in session and discuss wildlife, I wondered whether he was going to have them consider these wildlife people, Communists in America. The Congressmen predicted more spy arrests in Government, since they got this man Harry Gold over in Philadelphia. I also wondered whether the President is going to talk about drawing more red herrings across the path of these investigations. He certainly is hindering the work of catching them. Certainly when we find that the Communists have been working in this country as they have, we ought to get the aid and assistance of the President of the United States. He should be out leading the fight against these Communists instead of drawing red herrings across the path of the committees who try to work to eliminate the Communists in our country. This is getting to be a serious thing. There is a gentleman who used to work on the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], he

did a good job on that committee, but they took him off because he was too zealous in his work. I hope the Committee on Un-American Activities, all committees, all Members of Congress help rid ourselves of such people. They are dangerous to our form of government. We spend \$150,000 a year for the Un-American Activities Committee to trace them here in America, money well spent. You spend three billion to rid them in other countries, money poorly spent, why? Because we are meddling in too many countries and telling them how to run their governments, or trying to buy them out. Poor business for them and worse for us.

#### THE KANSAS CITY VOTE FRAUDS

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, in just 3 days the criminals who broke into the Kansas City courthouse to steal and destroy the evidence of vote frauds of the 1946 elections will go free on a technicality. The 3 years' statute of limitations under which these political criminals could have been prosecuted runs out Sunday.

It was in 1946 that President Truman personally ordered the purge of Representative Slaughter, of Missouri, who had opposed the man in the White House.

Only powerful influences could have blocked a complete prosecution of the theft of the vote-fraud evidence.

Crimes much more involved, and with much less political significance, have been easily solved and the guilty brought to justice. I think it is time that the President made another report to the people. I ask you, Mr. President, why the Department of Justice has not ordered any arrests in the theft of the vote-fraud evidence? I ask you, Mr. President, to make public the FBI report in this Kansas City case.

What happened in Kansas City was a crime against the very basis of our form of government—free and honest elections. This crime took place in Missouri, the home of the President.

Could it be that the Truman administration and its Pendergast cronies in Kansas City do not dare to take the handcuffs off the FBI and tell the Department of Justice to prosecute this case without fear or favor?

It is up to you, Mr. President, you have just three more days.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire from

the acting majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, permission has already been granted that when the House adjourns today it will adjourn to meet on Monday next. There is no legislative program for Monday and when the House meets on Monday, according to the unanimous-consent request which I made a few minutes ago, it will adjourn from Monday to Wednesday. On Wednesday, as previously agreed to, it will be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of permitting the Members to go to the Congressional Library to hear Secretary of State Acheson. I believe the time for the conference in the Congressional Library is 12:30 p. m. There will be no legislative business on Wednesday.

There is no legislative business for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, except that at any time after Wednesday conference reports may be called up.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether Secretary Acheson is going to tell us how many promises he has made to these foreign countries to bail them out and take care of them and send them billions of dollars to protect them when we ought to be looking after America. If he is going to do that, I will go over to hear him.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include a statement he made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Wheeler MacMillen.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article on the services of Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

#### BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further

consideration of the bill (H. R. 5990) to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5990, with Mr. HUBER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, anyone who has ever traveled Route 1 from Washington to Baltimore knows what traffic conditions are like on that road. The traffic problem on Route 1 is unique, as it is the main entrance to the Nation's Capital from the northeastern section of the country. Therefore, the legislation covered in H. R. 5990 must not be considered as an improvement to a Maryland road for the benefit of the State of Maryland, but as the development of an important line in the eastern coast traffic—in interstate traffic.

This project was initiated by the Government and the route from Jessups to the District line was chosen by the Government, so that the road could serve the Federal installations in that area, namely, Fort Meade, the District of Columbia Training School, the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge, the Beltsville Research Center of the Department of Agriculture, and the town of Greenbelt.

Furthermore, it was intended and still is, as a national-defense road to connect Fort Meade and the above installations with Washington.

The State of Maryland has begun work on the section from Jessups to Baltimore, as its share of the work on this highway to the Nation's Capital, on the assumption that the Federal Government would complete its portion. Eight miles have been completed and the remaining 5 miles will be completed by the end of 1952. Unless the Government keeps faith with the State and completes the section from Jessups to the District, the project will be of no value.

Maryland's portion of the work is costing \$14,680,000.

To facilitate the flow of traffic through Baltimore to the North, authority has been granted to construct a bridge over the mouth of the Patapsco River and the mouth of the Baltimore Harbor. The Chesapeake Bay bridge is now under construction, and when it is completed, the State will build a bridge or tunnel, either over or under, the Patapsco River and make the connection from the Baltimore-Washington expressway to the Philadelphia road. Furthermore, the city of Baltimore has appropriated \$20,000,000 for the first leg of a highway bypassing Baltimore.

The present route linking the North to the capital is one of the most heavily traveled and most dangerous highways in the country. Approximately 40,000 vehicles a day use this route. It has one of the highest accident and fatality rates

of any comparable highway in the country, due largely to the many intersecting roads and the development of stores, private homes and businesses along its entire length.

In 1949, 38 persons were killed and 739 injured on that brief stretch of road from the Baltimore City line to the District line. Over 11 percent of the persons killed in Maryland and 11 percent of the persons injured in Maryland last year, were killed or injured on a 29-mile section of that road, an extremely small segment of Maryland's interstate road system of 16,000 miles. Most of the persons killed and most of the cars involved in these accidents, were from out of the State.

During the first 4 months of this year, there were 317 accidents on this road. One hundred and seventy persons were injured and 13 were killed.

The new road would supplement the present route, greatly relieve the traffic congestion and provide a through way for north and south traffic to or through Washington.

This bill has been reported favorably by the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget, and I strongly urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. RICH. Will this road be so designed that there will not be crossroads? Will it be a through highway?

Mr. GARMATZ. It will be an expressway; that is right.

Mr. RICH. And the Federal Government is being asked to pay only \$14,000,000?

Mr. GARMATZ. No; the State of Maryland has spent approximately \$14,860,000 as its share.

Mr. RICH. Is the city of Baltimore going to see that the highway goes across the city?

Mr. GARMATZ. The Baltimore City Council has passed enabling legislation to start the first leg of the expressway through Baltimore city. There will be two branches to the highway; provision for the first one was passed by the city council approximately 2 weeks ago for taking the expressway through the city.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman believe that the city of Baltimore will construct a through-way across the city to enable traffic on this boulevard to get to the northern section of the country?

Mr. GARMATZ. There is no question about that. As I say, provision for the first leg has been passed by the city council and the money appropriated, and the work started.

Mr. RICH. What will the cost of this project be to the Federal Government?

Mr. GARMATZ. I believe \$3,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me there is nothing more important than a highway between Washington and the North, through Baltimore to Philadelphia and New York, so constructed as to avoid the hazards now existing on Route 1.

Mr. GARMATZ. There are two plans; one the city council has already ap-

proved, an expressway through the city; the other proposed plan is a tunnel under the harbor that will eventually bypass the city of Baltimore and connect with the Philadelphia road.

Mr. RICH. I would say to the State of Maryland that if they would construct a superhighway, a toll road between the District of Columbia and Gettysburg they would be accomplishing great good not only for the State of Maryland but for people traveling the highway. I do not know any place where another highway similar to the Pennsylvania Turnpike could be constructed that would yield greater benefits to the traveling public.

Mr. GARMATZ. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] can answer for the Gettysburg road.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, I want first to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and tell him that about 2 weeks ago the Maryland State Roads Commission had a meeting at Gettysburg, Pa., with the Pennsylvania Highway Commission. There it was decided that plans would be prepared by the Maryland Commission and submitted to the Pennsylvania Commission with the thought in mind of building a toll road from Washington to Gettysburg.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEALL. Gladly.

Mr. RICH. If such a road could be constructed it would be of great benefit not only to the State of Maryland but to the country. Furthermore, the State of Maryland would not be out any money. People who use that highway would gladly pay toll to travel a highway that did not have a million curves and that was not subject to the present dangers of that highway.

Mr. BEALL. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I personally have long advocated it as a member of the Maryland State Roads Commission. It would be a self-liquidating project.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Would it not be a great idea for the public to build roads of this sort and the people using the roads pay for them? Let us have toll gates and toll houses all over the roads of the country with thousands of individuals employed to collect fees from people using the roads. It would be a great development all over the United States. We got away from that sort of thing in the Colonial and Revolutionary days. Now the gentleman wants to go back to it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the gentleman from Idaho that if there is anybody pigheaded enough to think we ought to go back to such backwoods methods, he just is all wrong. We are not going back to any such backwoods philosophy. We have a fine system of free public high-



ways. Anybody who wants to use the toll highways does so through preference, not compulsion. A fine toll road between here and Gettysburg would be used by the people out of preference, and it would not cost the people of this country anything. We will balance the budget, and we will not do what the gentleman from Idaho fears. The gentleman from Idaho thinks that some people in this country are just so dumb that they do not know what they are talking about.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. As to whether what I asked is a pigheaded policy, I am willing to leave to the judgment of the House and the people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; I will leave it to them as to who is advocating the most pigheaded plan, and I want the phrase "pigheaded" left in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. Do not worry about my taking it out.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I want to confirm the statement made by the gentleman from New York with reference to the hazards existing on the highway between here and the great national shrine at Gettysburg, and I share his view in urging that something be done to correct that situation. I do have a suggestion to make, although I appreciate that the gentleman represents only one end of the highway. When we go to the airport to take off on a flight there are some boxes out there. I suggest to the gentleman that he give consideration to the idea that there might be installed some boxes at either end of this hazardous highway similar to what we have at the airports. When any passenger wants to take off on a flight he can buy life insurance in varying amounts for 25 cents, 50 cents, or \$1. It might be well to give consideration to installing machines like that so a person traveling that highway might spend 25 cents, 50 cents, or \$1, and make certain that while we will not be protected our heirs will.

Mr. BEALL. In answer to the gentleman from New York, may I say that we have long felt the need for a new road. We are well aware of the hazards that exist on that road.

We have been told that the Maryland State Road Commission would have built the road from Washington to Baltimore if it had not waited for the Bureau of Public Roads and the other Government agencies that wanted to build the road through Government property, namely Fort Meade, Beltsville, and other Government reservations. But the war came on and this program has been held up some 5 years.

Mr. COLE of New York. In fairness to the two States involved in this highway between Washington and Gettysburg I think I should say that with respect to the roads in the State of Pennsylvania I have encountered no hazards whatever.

Mr. BEALL. If we are through with the Gettysburg-Washington road, which

we hope will come in due time, I would like to say in connection with this road that the State of Maryland is helping the Government. Maryland is actually helping the Government build a road to the Government's own reservations and Government-owned property.

I hope this legislation will be passed in order that we can get this road started and completed at an early date.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, as the author of this bill and as the Representative of the district through which this road runs, naturally I am interested in its passage, but in considering it today we must embrace within our deliberations the national aspects of this road. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] has outlined the vast Government territory through which this road passes. He has referred to the number of accidents that have occurred upon Route No. 1. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] will call to your attention additional reasons why the bill should be passed. My esteemed colleague on the minority side, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], former member of the State Roads Commission, has expressed to the House the urgent need of this project.

I will, therefore, briefly call to your attention three or four reasons, from the national point of view, why this road should be built. First of all, this section of the road serves Government territory and in addition to that there is the matter of faith involved. Maryland would never have programed this road on the location that has been surveyed had it not been drawn into it by the Federal Government. We would have programed it over a territory that could have been developed, and thus increase the assessable basis for Maryland. Maryland would never have planned a road with a minimum right of way of 1,000 feet running up to 3,000 feet had they not been approached by the Federal Government and asked that this road be built and constructed in this location. As the Federal Government selected the location and programed the engineering, and as Maryland abandoned the location where it would have constructed the road and on the faith of the agreement and at the request of the Federal Government, built the north half of the road down to Fort Meade, we respectfully urge that the construction of the south half through reservations is a Federal obligation and not a pork barrel measure, as was indicated by one of the gentlemen here last week.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am still unable to understand why this less than 19 miles of highway should cost approximately \$790,000 a mile—I believe that is the cost of it—especially in view of the fact that there is no land being condemned. Practically every foot of this highway is over Government property. I would like to have someone enlighten me as to why the enormous cost of construction of this roadway.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. In answering, I can compare the Maryland section of the road with the Washington section of the road and tell you why the cost is \$14,000,000. In addition to acquiring land, the topography of the land makes it necessary to build bridges—several overpasses and several underpasses. The bridges run from one to one and one-half million dollars. The bridge that spans the main line of the Pennsylvania Railroad will cost \$1,500,000, and that is only 600 or 700 feet of the railway.

Mr. GROSS. But in the State of Maryland you are acquiring land on which to build this right-of-way.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman understands that the 12 miles that Maryland is building is costing over \$14,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Your land up in Maryland is level, is it not?

Mr. FALLON. No: in some cases the topography of the land is quite rugged.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the Pennsylvania Turnpike cost \$400,000 a mile, on the average, to build.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman asked that question the other day, and in my statement I gave him the figure. The Pennsylvania Turnpike is 160 miles long. The Federal Government put up a grant of 45 percent of that amount and the Federal Government loaned the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission the remaining 55 percent. The cost of that highway was \$450,000 per mile. Costs have more than doubled since that highway was constructed, and Pennsylvania today is extending that highway a distance of 90 miles at a cost in excess of over \$1,000,000 a mile.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, construction of the Pennsylvania Turnpike, for the most part, was through mountains, and the cost must have been far greater than the cost of this highway. I cannot believe that this is anything but an extravagant procedure on the part of the Government to allot \$15,000,000 for building less than 19 miles of roadway.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, instead of being an expensive highway, those of us who were here at the time the turnpike was constructed know that the Pennsylvania Turnpike was constructed in the country, as you know if you have traveled over it, and they used a right-of-way that did not cost very much, that had been planned at one time for the construction of a railroad by Mr. Frick, and they used the tunnels in that area and they got the roadway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman comparing the building of the Pennsylvania turnpike, through that mountainous country, with building a road through this soft, easily-excavated dirt out here in Maryland?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman can easily determine that for himself. I suggest he drive out to where the Baltimore-Washington Parkway grading has been completed as it connects with Defense Highway at the District of Columbia line. You will thus see that the country is rugged, and that grading the rugged and broken country is expensive.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5990 does just this: It changes the jurisdiction of this proposed highway from Washington to Fort Meade from the Public Roads Administration to the National Park Service. It does one other thing: It limits the cost to complete this highway to \$13,000,000.

Many questions have been asked as to why the Federal Government should construct this highway from the District of Columbia into Fort Meade. It has been answered two or three times by previous speakers that this road was initiated by the Federal Government to serve 52 square miles of Government property. As I stated last week, that is only 10 miles less than the area of the whole city of Washington.

The highway was designed in 1942. Two million dollars was appropriated by money that was left over from the NRA. President Roosevelt directed the Public Roads Administration to build a defense highway from Washington into Fort Meade, serving the other Government areas. All the property has been acquired and all the rights-of-way have been acquired from Fort Meade into Washington. A strip a minimum of 400 feet wide has been cleared and 6 miles of it, as I understand, have been drained and graded. The other part of it has not been touched but has been acquired.

One question was, Why should a highway 18 miles in length cost \$13,000,000? If the Pennsylvania turnpike cost \$450,000 a mile 5 years ago, at today's prices this road could be more conservatively constructed at \$13,000,000 than the Pennsylvania turnpike was.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I notice a white mark in there. That is not on Government land?

Mr. FALLON. The reason it is not on Government land is that if they tried to take it through Government land it would cost too much to construct, so in some instances Maryland donated the right-of-way and in some instances they had to acquire it from private ownership.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As I understand from what the gentleman said at first, the National Park Service would look after this road. Is this to be maintained by the Government?

Mr. FALLON. It is to be maintained by the Government, because in most part it runs through Government property.

Mr. RICH. Is it going to be something like the road between here and Mount Vernon?

Mr. FALLON. I can tell the gentleman this, that it is going to be one of the most up-to-date and safest highways in the United States.

Maryland has been complimented by the foremost engineers that the part Maryland has already constructed is the safest, and it will be one of the prettiest highways throughout the country. The main reason, however, is not to construct a parkway. There are two reasons for it. One is access to Government property, and the other is to alleviate the traffic on roadway No. 1, where 450 people a year are being maimed and in some years as high as 50 have been killed, almost 1 a week.

Mr. RICH. Is this to be a truck highway as well as a passenger-car highway?

Mr. FALLON. Trucks will not be allowed on the Government end of the highway.

The other end of the highway will be controlled by Maryland State laws.

Mr. Chairman, this highway has been in the Halls of Congress now for 9 years. The present highway between Washington and Baltimore is the most inadequate highway in the country. The thirty-and-some-odd-mile stretch of that highway killed more people than any 30-mile stretch of highway in the United States. In addition to that, there is almost \$4,000,000 worth of property damage each year. So you can see that this highway will not only pay off by taking the gruesome details of accidents and deaths out of the daily papers, but will pay off in money saved on property damage.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Do you believe that the spending of this \$15,000,000 in our own country to help our own people is more important than spending money to build a lot of things in some of these foreign countries which we are doing so much of at the present time?

Mr. FALLON. In answer to the gentleman, I will say our Federal Government is spending more money on roads today, or almost as much money, as was provided for in the general-roads bill which we passed last week.

Mr. RICH. Do you think the Members who voted for that kind of legislation are happy about it?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware of the dangers on the present highway. In the course of this month on my last two trips down here from Philadelphia I have seen accidents both times. The wonder is why Baltimore has not done something about providing an adequate bypass around the city. I do not know of any city or town that has shown less interest in getting its motorists through the town than Baltimore. I think Baltimore is being very backward about this highway problem.

I think the city of Baltimore would be well advised if the city council and shown a little more forethought with its planning rather than to wait until the last 2 weeks to adopt the first step toward a progressive plan to move the traffic around the city.

Another thing which concerns me is this. The Pennsylvania Turnpike is supported by toll receipts; it was begun on that basis. This new Baltimore-Washington highway presents two parallel roads, for future use. Each road will, therefore, have less traffic, at least at the beginning, than the original road carried. It seems to me the motorist could well be given a choice as to whether he wants to use the old road or use the new express road and pay a toll. There is no reason why the Federal Government should bear all of this burden.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. FALLON. I would like to say in answer to the gentleman's statement concerning the backward position of Baltimore in the handling of its traffic problem that I am sure he must have observed that most of the old cities have very much difficulty in handling traffic problems.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am aware of that.

Mr. FALLON. Baltimore has done a good job with what they have had in the past. But the future will be different. They are going to spend \$20,000,000 to alleviate a condition which will cost up to \$50,000,000 a year. The Governor of the State of Maryland made a statement just 2 weeks ago that after the bay bridge is completed, they are going to dig a tunnel under Baltimore Harbor to carry the traffic from the western end of the city to the eastern end, to connect up with the Philadelphia highway which may be completed before this road is completed on this end of the Washington Boulevard.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I can say to the gentleman that if all the profanity directed by motorists at Baltimore traffic were joined end-to-end they would make a remarkable collection of four-letter words.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my record in Congress will justify the statement that I do not favor spending money which is not absolutely essential and necessary.

I am of the firm conviction that this highway is needed, not only for this area but for the country as a whole.

I want to call to the attention of some of the Members from the far West and the Midwest that the other day we passed a bill which set up a program costing many times the amount of dollars involved in this bill, for forest trails and roads. This bill certainly justifies Members from the far West and Midwest giving it very keen consideration.

In reply to the gentleman from Iowa relative to the cost, in my opinion the cost of this project will compare very favorably with any other highway projects of comparable location and construction. If we break the costs down,



we have approximately \$3,000,000 for grading. Between four and a half and five million for bridges. Approximately \$3,000,000 for paving. That is a very low figure when you take into consideration the average width of this highway, approximately 700 feet.

Now, the Pennsylvania Turnpike has been referred to. Times have changed since the Pennsylvania Turnpike was constructed. Costs have been multiplied by two or more since that time. If we were constructing these highways in some States we would have a million and a half or \$2,000,000 per mile.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Just remember this: that the Pennsylvania Turnpike is entirely different from this highway in this way, that it is being built from funds that will eventually be paid back by the people who use it. The taxpayers will continue to spend money to keep up the highway provided for here. That is the great difference.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I expect I have traveled that turnpike as much as anyone, and I appreciate it and am always willing to pay that toll, but we must take this into consideration, that we are in the area of our Nation's Capital. This is not a highway for a small group of people. We could categorize this highway as a defense highway, if you please. We must realize that this is our Nation's Capital. We must make adequate provision for people to get out of this Capital if and when they might need to. Also, there are a great number of workers who will take advantage of this highway.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says times have changed since the Pennsylvania Turnpike was constructed. I will say they have. We did not have a \$260,000,000 debt when that turnpike was built.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I will agree with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentleman know who monopolizes all the concessions on the Pennsylvania Turnpike?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That does not come under the jurisdiction of this Congress. That was agreed upon by those who had the power to make the agreement. Whether the gentleman was a Member of the Congress or not at that time, I do not know; but if he was, he should have raised that question at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] has expired.

H. R. 5990—BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, when the bill was before the House and in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, I presented the views of the Committee on Public Works and made my

presentation of the bill as shown by my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, May 15, 1950, pages 7044-7045. I endeavored to answer all questions by Members during general debate. I sum up by saying:

First. There is only one highway between Washington and Baltimore. It is No. 1, a four-lane highway, and it is on the interregional system in a thickly populated area especially in the vicinity of Baltimore and Washington. It would cost the Federal Government as best I can ascertain more for its share of widening the said highway with two additional lanes than it will cost the Government to build the parkway under the terms of the bill.

Second. The President by directive as authorized by law allocated \$2,000,000 to building the parkway from the District line to Fort Meade, a distance of approximately 18.8 miles with the understanding that the State of Maryland would construct a four-lane divided highway from Fort Meade to Baltimore. This road is under construction, and as is disclosed by the hearings, the estimated cost to the State of Maryland is \$14,227,135. Maryland would not have built such an expensive road but for the understanding that the parkway which would be a four-lane divided highway would be constructed by the Federal Government to Washington from Fort Meade.

Third. The limitation on the cost in the pending bill by the Federal Government is \$13,000,000 additional, and with the \$14,000,000 by the State of Maryland, aggregates \$27,000,000. One-half of the \$14,000,000 by the State of Maryland is Federal aid funds. Certainly the parkway from Washington to Fort Meade and the highway from Baltimore to Fort Meade is equally as important as an interregional or defense highway, and might well be added to the interregional system. If added, the Federal Government under existing law, and under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950 already passed by the House, is authorized to pay three-fourths of the total cost, which would be substantially the Federal cost of the pending bill. Moreover, the pending bill provides for a parkway much more desirable than an ordinary four-lane highway. The public will be benefited thereby. It will be maintained as all other parkways in the District of Columbia and elsewhere are maintained by the United States.

Fourth. The 18.8 miles from the District line has been increased by amendment by adding one-half mile so that the total length is 19.3 miles. The estimated cost, as I have pointed out on April 5, is \$680,000 per mile, but if the \$2,000,000 already spent is included, the estimated cost is \$770,000 per mile. The Pennsylvania Turnpike when constructed some years ago cost \$450,000 per mile, and since that time the costs have more than doubled. The turnpike is being extended to Philadelphia today at an estimated cost of \$700,000 to \$1,000,000 per mile, with no tunnels and in a less rugged country than the original turnpike. The Pennsylvania Turnpike goes through an unsettled area as originally constructed

just as the Baltimore-Washington Parkway traverses a rugged and largely unsettled area. It is a difficult country. The two railroads and the existing No. 1 highway took the best and earliest routes.

Fifth. The public convenience will be promoted. It is estimated that 20,000 vehicles will travel the parkway every day as soon as it is opened. The grading will be 56 feet for each roadway, or a total of 112 feet. Bridges are to be planned with a total pavement width of 72 feet. There will be a divided two-lane highway. Each pavement will be 24 feet wide. Room will be left for a third pavement that will undoubtedly be built in the near future.

Sixth. Sixteen bridges are to be built. Two of these are railway grade separations. Three are river crossings, and eleven are grade separations with State and county highways. These bridges will cost approximately \$5,270,000. Under existing law the Government pays for all railway grade separations on all Federal-aid highways.

Seventh. Six miles of the parkway have been graded and drained. There are 13.6 miles to be graded and drained. The estimated cost of this work is \$3,990,000 or \$300,000 per mile. In addition, 5.5 miles of roads consisting of interchanges between the parkway and other public roads will have to be constructed. There are 1.5 miles of State and county roads that will have to be rebuilt. Some 3 miles of local roads will have to be relocated. The cost of the parkway, therefore, will be far less than is being paid for similar parkways today in Pennsylvania, and, as I have previously, on May 5, pointed out, in New Jersey.

Eighth. As I have previously pointed out, the bill cannot be regarded as a precedent. It will provide for communication from Washington to Federal installations including Fort Meade, Beltsville, and Greenbelt.

Ninth. The pending bill will provide, without costing the Federal Government nearly as much to widen the existing road, a parkway to facilitate travel between Washington and Baltimore and intervening points without tolls, and at the same time it will relieve congestion between Washington and Baltimore, which is one of the most heavily traveled areas in the United States. It will provide for the United States keeping faith with Maryland. The limitations of the costs of the bill will really result in economy to the Government in its construction.

Under the bill the Baltimore Parkway, with a divided four-lane highway that may be enlarged later, will be constructed, without tolls, at less expense to the Government than widening, strengthening, and straightening the existing No. 1 boulevard from Washington to Baltimore.

There are 16 bridges to be built as I have said; 2 of these are railroad grade separations, 3 are river crossings, and 11 are grade separations with State or county highways. On all Federal aid highways it will be remembered the Federal Government pays the entire costs of railway grade separations no matter the type of highways on which they are

located.) The parkway is to promote traffic primarily from Washington to Baltimore via Fort Meade. Like the Pennsylvania Turnpike, it will provide for high rates of speed. There cannot be high rates of speed if there are concessions or filling stations at every mile or so along the parkway. The parkway will be built as other parkways. It will facilitate traffic. The present Baltimore Boulevard retards traffic. Four-lane highways should really be constructed within 10 miles of every large city in the United States. The public will be benefited thereby. Proper access is provided in the parkway. Interchanges between the parkway and other park roads are required. Some county roads must be rebuilt. There will be no precedent for I know of no other similar case where a parkway could be constructed more cheaply than in enlarging an existing defense highway. Such a case has not been brought to the attention of the committee.

Filling stations are not allowed along the parkways in the District of Columbia, nor are they allowed generally except at stated intervals and access points along any parkways whether it be the Pennsylvania Turnpike, the Merritt Highway, or the parkways in the vicinity of New York City. The rights-of-way have already been acquired. The comparative costs of the parkway are less than the cost of parkways in Pennsylvania and, as I have previously pointed out, in New Jersey.

With respect to costs, if the State of Maryland is spending for 12 miles \$16,000,000, it does strike me that for 19.3 miles of parkway with other interchange and local roads of about 10 miles, the Federal Government is getting economical construction for a total of \$13,000,000, or for approximately \$680,000 a mile for the approximately 19.3 miles of parkway, which parkway has a four-lane divided highway with 4 feet of concrete on each side with 12-foot lanes and with total grading of 112 feet wide so as to provide for two additional 12-foot lanes on each side of the divided highway and with rights-of-way from 400 to 1,000 feet. Under this bill the country will be afforded an excellent through highway from Washington to Baltimore at less cost to the Federal Government than the Federal share of widening the existing Highway No. 1.

I emphasize that the Government should keep faith with the agreement made with the State of Maryland in 1942, but I also emphasize that in carrying out the agreement there is an opportunity to provide for a parkway synonymous with a turnpike in the congested area between Washington and Baltimore for the use and benefit of all the people of the United States as they have occasion to travel between these two cities, at less expense to the Federal Government than it would be to widen and enlarge the present Highway No. 1, and thus afford far better facilities for easy and through traffic than if the said highway were widened and enlarged.

As I pointed out on May 15, construction has been begun. A point of order against the appropriations requested by the President to carry on the work would

not lie. The pending bill places a ceiling on the amount that may be expended. The pending bill should be passed not only to keep faith with the people of Maryland, but to provide for additional facilities for the American public without discriminating against other parts of the United States inasmuch as the passage of the pending bill, on account of Government reservations through which the parkway extends, will not be a precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That hereafter all lands and easements heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States for the right-of-way for the projected parkway road which is being constructed by the Bureau of Public Roads between Anacostia Park in the District of Columbia and the northern boundary of Fort Meade in the State of Maryland, including any lands required for additional connections to the Maryland road system shall be regarded as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs, to be known as the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and it shall be developed, administered, and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), the provisions of which act, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended over and made applicable to said parkway, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The parkway shall be developed, operated, and administered as a limited access road primarily to provide a dignified, protected, safe, and suitable approach for passenger-vehicle traffic to the National Capital and for an uninterrupted means of access between the several Federal establishments adjacent thereto and the seat of government in the District of Columbia. To avoid impairment of this purpose, the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce, shall control the location, limit the number of access points, and regulate the use of said parkway by various classes or types of vehicles or traffic.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior in his administration of this parkway is authorized, in his discretion, to accept from private owners, State and local governments, lands, rights-of-way over lands, or other interests in lands adjacent to such parkway, and also to accept the transfer of jurisdiction to the Department of the Interior of adjacent lands for park and recreational purposes from any Federal agency or department, without reimbursement to such Federal agency or department having jurisdiction thereof, when such transfer is mutually agreed upon by the Secretary and such department or agency; and such transfer of jurisdiction by any such department or agency of the Federal Government in possession of such lands is hereby authorized.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to any lands, rights-of-way, or easements over lands owned by the State of Maryland which may be offered by the Governor of Maryland for the proper development and administration of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in accordance with the provisions of the laws of Maryland, chapter 644, approved May 6, 1943, and subject to such conditions respecting control and jurisdiction as may be mutually agreed

upon by the designated agencies of the United States and the State of Maryland whenever such conveyance may affect any park lands acquired under the provisions of the act of Congress, May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482).

SEC. 5. That money appropriated for parkways administered by the National Park Service by the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure for continuing the construction, development, maintenance, and policing of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

Mr. MCGREGOR (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, but subject to amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman accept this modification of his request: That the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, that committee amendments may be considered en bloc, and that after the committee amendments are disposed of the Chair call the sections for amendment in the order in which they appear in the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I accept the gentleman's modification.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modified request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "hereafter."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "projected" after the word "the" and strike out "road" after the word "parkway."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "Maryland", insert "the extension of said parkway into the District of Columbia over park lands to the intersection of New York Avenue extended with the boundary of Anacostia Park, and."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "system", insert "all of which."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "be", insert "constructed."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "be", insert "constructed."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "dignified."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "uninterrupted" and insert in lieu thereof "additional."

Page 3, line 11, insert the following at the end of the paragraph:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the lands required for said parkway within the suburban resettlement project known as Greenbelt, Md., as surveyed by the Bureau of Public Roads and shown on plats AOV-WBP-3 and AOV-WBP-4 prepared by said Bureau and dated July 10, 1946, and within the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Md., as surveyed by the Bureau of Public Roads and shown on plat SOM-WB-10 prepared by said Bureau and dated June 22, 1944, are hereby transferred, without reimbursement, to the administrative jurisdiction and control of the Department of the Interior, for the purposes of this act, subject to such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Public Housing Administration and the Department of Agriculture, respectively, with the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Public Roads."

Page 4, line 1, strike out "That" and insert in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 6, the."

Page 4, after line 6, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6. The cost of construction of the parkway shall not exceed the additional sum of \$13,000,000."



The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to section 1?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect and affection for my colleagues from the great State of Maryland. If there is any road needed in this country, in the great United States, it is an arterial road between the town of Baltimore and the Capital City of Washington. But this bill, much as I respect and esteem my colleague from Maryland, this bill is a rank discrimination; it discriminates against all the other States in the Union. It is a discrimination against the people who have paid taxes for years along the right-of-way of this road; it is a rank discrimination.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I will yield for a question, but let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that I want to bring out the facts of the bill by reading the text of the bill that the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member failed to bring out. I am going to point it out to the members of this committee. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman charges that this bill is discriminatory. Did the gentleman vote for the highway act a few days ago that carried legislation covering forest trails and highways?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The State of Idaho, that I have the honor to represent, is 72 percent owned by the Federal Government. I have been fighting for appropriations for forest roads and trails all the years I have been in Congress, for liberal appropriations for forest roads and trails to get into this Government-owned land. We are totally dependent on this Congress and the Forest Service for access roads and trails in these immense Government-owned areas. They are very much needed. There is no more comparison for saddling the people of America with the construction and maintenance of this road as compared with forest roads and trails than there is between day and night. You might as well say the State and counties should build roads through military reservations or in the national parks.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is not the gentleman inconsistent when he says he voted for forest roads and trails and now says this bill is discriminatory?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I may say to the gentleman that when we vote for forest roads and trails we are voting to open up timber resources, land, and minerals that all of the people of the United States own. The appropriation for forest roads and trails is to give access to national forest timber for fire protection. It is not for privately owned land and timber out there at all.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Does not this federally financed road go through Federal parks and Federal property?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Only partly. It goes about one-third through private property and the rest through Government property.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. It goes through 52 square miles of Government-owned property.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. There was a map here and you had an opportunity to see the private land which this road traverses.

This bill is discriminatory because you are not only loading the Federal Government with the cost of construction of this road but you are perpetually saddling the American people with the maintenance of that road. In other words, the people of the United States are not only building the road but we are saddling them with the expense of maintaining it. This is discriminatory against the other States that cannot enjoy this kind of road construction. We have the Federal-aid system and we would be very happy under the Federal-aid plan to contribute 50 percent and let Maryland contribute the other 50 percent and build this road the same as the other States in the country have to build their roads.

Now let us see what this bill contains. In the first place, this road is 400 feet wide which means that anyone who owns land along the road cannot enjoy any benefits. They cannot put up any kind of a hotel or place of business along the road. They are barred from doing that. They do not have access to the road. On this road to Mount Vernon, this national parkway, we are considering a bill before the committee that keeps a big addition to the town of Alexandria from access to the road. As you drive along the Mount Vernon highway you can look through the trees and see the homes that have been built at great expense and cars parked all along the streets behind the trees and parking strip, yet they have no outlet to this parkway. The Park Service refuses to give them an outlet. This is a scheme to perpetuate the same plan for the road involved in this bill to the extent of 19 miles at least.

Now, this bill provides in section 2:

To avoid impairment of this purpose, the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce, shall control the location, limit the number of access points, and regulate the use of said parkway by various classes or types of vehicles or traffic.

What does that mean? If you have ever traveled this celebrated Pennsylvania Turnpike you will find it is patronized almost exclusively by trucks. These trucks can save the cost of the toll out of what they would otherwise pay out for gas. That Pennsylvania Turnpike is 400 feet wide. No other road has access to it. You must go either over it or under it. You will find that the concessions are wholly controlled by the biggest monopoly in these United States, namely, the du Ponts and the Standard Oil Co. That is what they want here and will get if this bill goes

through. You say you are building a 400-foot highway for scenic purposes. How much money will this country lose in taxes on the business places that will be barred from the road?

Mr. Chairman, I have seen these monopolies creeping in all the time. Now, you want to give the Park Service a monopoly in granting concessions along this big highway running from Washington to Baltimore. If you and I had the money that is paid for excess gas that is being used today for 1 year on the trucks that have to pull those hills between Laurel and Baltimore we would have enough to buy the finest home in Washington. Day in and day out and all through the night these big loaded trucks and trailers grind over the steep little hills on U S 1 between Washington and Baltimore using up this precious gas that will soon be rationed to us. Why the surplus gas they use grinding over these obsolete hilly roads would pay for a level road many times over and now Maryland is inveigling our Government to come in and build and maintain the road but keep the trucks out while they go using up this precious gas needlessly. Talk about conservation, the day is not far off when our wastefulness will catch up with us and we will have to give a reason for the use of the gas we try to buy at the filling stations.

If there is any place in the United States where we need a roadway so that we can save this precious gas that is used by these trucks, gas that is needed by our airplanes in the air and our submarines under the sea, conservation if you please, what we need is a level grade road between the great Capital City of Washington and the city of Baltimore. We have two great transcontinental railroads running between Washington and Baltimore, the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore & Ohio. They found a level grade route to go through that territory. But, as it is, if you want to go to Baltimore from Washington, you have to consume one-third extra gas to pull all the hills on this long winding, dippy road between here and Baltimore. We need a road, but we do not need to saddle the American people with the cost of building and maintaining that road perpetually. That is discrimination against the rest of the States of this Union. I favored the construction of the parkway between the Blue Ridge Mountains and the Smoky Mountains, that scenic parkway, and for the Natchez Trace, but I am not in favor of loading the American people with the cost of constructing and building this road between Baltimore and Washington, one of the richest cities in the United States, and if there is a city that has a bigger payroll and gives less for the payroll it receives, it is this District of Columbia and the city of Washington. Maryland and the Government have plenty of money to pay for the road under the Federal-aid plan, and why saddle the people of the United States with this kind of a proposition, and at the same time take all abutting property off the tax roll on either side of this road with your 400-foot strip.

In driving out of Washington to Suitland the other day I was trying to speculate how much land was taken off the

permanent tax roll by building this scenic route 400 feet wide, with that enormous portion adjacent thereto taken off the tax roll because private owners cannot build along the road. They have no access. This is a backward step. This is not a forward step in the development of our country.

I am opposed to the bill, and I shall vote accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want the Record to show that I am opposed to this measure. I think the cost is excessive. I think it sets a dangerous precedent, both from the standpoint of Federal construction of this road and from the standpoint of cost of maintenance and policing of the road, the costs of which will be borne by the Federal Government through all the years to come.

I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi who spoke of the million-dollar-a-mile cost of the Pennsylvania Turnpike, on the extension at the west end, that it is my understanding they are digging tunnels there. You are not digging any tunnels on this highway. If the cost of construction of that extension is a million dollars a mile, it in no sense excuses the excessive cost of this highway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Are there any amendments to section 2?

Are there any amendments to section 3?

Are there any amendments to section 4?

Are there any amendments to section 5?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill close in 3 minutes, and I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to repeat, but with respect to the cost of this parkway I again emphasize that the Bureau of Public Roads has advised the committee that this parkway, at a cost of \$13,000,000 as provided in the bill, would cost far less to the Federal Government than the Federal share of reconditioning, widening, straightening, and strengthening No. 1 between here and Baltimore.

I cannot agree with my friend, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]. Those who travel parkways secure gas before they enter the highways or at provided accesses. Parkways do not permit filling stations every mile or so. They do not permit other concessions that would cause speeds to slow down. They contemplate reasonably high speeds. The public demands a highway better than the existing No. 1 Highway between Washington and Baltimore. I do not agree that the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway should be absolutely destroyed by buildings immediately adjacent to the highway, by filling stations every mile or so along the highway. The very purpose of a parkway is to prevent such

concessions and thus to promote traffic at reasonably safe high speeds.

Within 10 miles of every large city of the United States there should be four-lane divided highways. The increasing population and the increasing number of vehicles demand such. Half of the traffic in the United States is in urban areas. It would be unwise for Congress not to provide for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway where it extends to and through Government reservations, and where the cost will be less than the cost of enlarging and straightening Highway No. 1. I emphasize that there is no precedent because the rights-of-way are largely through Government reservations.

I remind the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] that all of the highways and roads in the national parks, practically all of which are located west of the Mississippi River, and all of the highways and roads in the national forests, most of which are located west of the Mississippi River, and many of which are located in the State that he represents, there being something like 71,000 miles of these roads and parkways in national parks, national forests, and reservations west of the Mississippi River, many of which are located in the State of Idaho, are under Government control, construction, and maintenance. The traffic on these roads is nothing like as dense and the danger to the public nothing like as great as between Washington and Baltimore. I do not believe that the beneficiaries of the roads through national parks, through other parkways, through forests, at Federal expense, and the maintenance of these roads at Federal expense, can logically criticize the construction of a parkway through Federal installations to provide much needed additional through-traffic facilities in the most congested area in the United States.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is opposed to concessions. Did he ever run out of gas on a freezing night?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman begs a question. Those who are capable of using parkways to advantage are certainly capable of providing the necessary gas for the operation of their motor vehicles. As I have already pointed out, there are no concessions or filling stations every mile on turnpikes or parkways. They are intended for fast traveling. The United States pays the entire costs of the parkways through Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia, of other parkways through the Blue Ridge and Smoky Mountains, and all parkways and park roads to national parks in the Rocky Mountain area. There can be no through traffic without adequate highways that safeguard through traffic. Concessions must yield to access requirements and to the safety of the public. Personally I would like to see more parkways constructed in and near all of the large cities of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. HUBER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5990) to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 567, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 71, noes 10.

So the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland and its extension into the District of Columbia as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include certain resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Lands today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record two resolutions which were adopted by the Public Lands Committee of the House this morning, and two acts relating to this procedure, concerning the expenditure of rehabilitation and betterment costs on certain reclamation projects. These resolutions approve the findings of the Secretary of the Interior on these contracts as outlined in his letters to both the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives.

On October 7, 1949, the President approved an act to provide for the return



of rehabilitation and betterment costs of Federal reclamation projects, and on March 3, 1950, an act was approved amending that act to a slight degree, whereby it becomes possible for the above-named committees to express their approval of the determination by the Secretary of the Interior of the terms of a contract for the repayment of rehabilitation and betterment costs on reclamation projects.

These resolutions are in relation to the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, and the Chinook division of the Milk River project, in the State of Montana.

The two acts referred to and the resolutions which were adopted today by the Public Lands Committee of the House are also included:

**RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE EXPENDITURE OF REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT FUNDS ON THE MALTA IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND THE GLASGOW IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MILK RIVER PROJECT, MONTANA**

Whereas the act of October 7, 1949 (Public Law 335, 81st Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by the act of March 3, 1950 (Public Law 451, 81st Cong., 2d sess.), provides that expenditure of funds specifically appropriated for rehabilitation and betterment of irrigation systems on projects governed by the Federal reclamation laws shall be made only after the organizations shall have obligated themselves for the return thereof in installments fixed in accordance with their ability to pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the determination of the Secretary of the Interior does not become effective until the expiration of 60 days after it has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, or on a date prior to the expiration of such 60 days in any case in which each such committee approves an earlier date and notifies the Secretary, in writing, of such approval; and

Whereas in a letter dated May 24, 1950, the Secretary of the Interior submitted to the Committee on Public Lands his findings relating to the return of rehabilitation and betterment funds to be expended on the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, Milk River project, Montana; and

Whereas the Committee on Public Lands has, in session with a quorum present, this day approved the findings of the Secretary of the Interior in these premises: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Lands give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior of its approval of his determination in these premises.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,  
J. HARDIN PETERSON, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 25th day of May 1950.

**RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE EXPENDITURE OF REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT FUNDS ON THE CHINOOK DIVISION OF THE MILK RIVER PROJECT, MONTANA**

Whereas the act of October 7, 1949 (Public Law 335, 81st Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by the act of March 3, 1950 (Public Law 451, 81st Cong., 2d sess.) provides that expenditure of funds specifically appropriated for rehabilitation and betterment of irrigation systems on projects governed by the Federal reclamation laws shall be made only after the organizations shall have obligated themselves for the return thereof in installments fixed in accordance with their ability to pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the determination of the Secretary of the Interior does not become effective

until the expiration of 60 days after it has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives or on a date prior to the expiration of such 60 days in any case in which each such committee approves an earlier date and notifies the Secretary, in writing, of such approval; and

Whereas in a letter dated May 24, 1950, the Secretary of the Interior submitted to the Committee on Public Lands his findings relating to the return of rehabilitation and betterment funds to be expended on the Chinook division of the Milk River project, Montana; and

Whereas the Committee on Public Lands has, in session with a quorum present, this day approved the findings of the Secretary of the Interior in these premises: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Lands give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior of its approval of his determination in these premises.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,  
J. HARDIN PETERSON, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 25th day of May 1950.

[Public Law 335—81st Cong.]

[Ch. 650—1st sess.]

H. R. 1694

An act to provide for the return of rehabilitation and betterment costs of Federal reclamation projects

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That expenditures of funds hereafter specifically appropriated for rehabilitation and betterment of irrigation systems on projects governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) shall be made only after the organizations concerned shall have obligated themselves for the return thereof in installments fixed in accordance with their ability to pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior in the light of their outstanding repayment obligations, and which shall, to the fullest practicable extent, be scheduled for return with their construction charge installments or otherwise scheduled as he shall determine. No such determination of the Secretary of the Interior shall become effective until the expiration of 60 days after it has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives. The term "rehabilitation and betterment," as used in this act, shall mean maintenance, including replacements, which cannot be financed currently, as otherwise contemplated by the Federal reclamation laws in the case of operation and maintenance costs, but shall not include construction, the costs of which are returnable, in whole or in part, through "construction charges" as that term is defined in section 2 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Such rehabilitation and betterment work may be performed by contract, by force-account, or, notwithstanding any other law and subject only to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem appropriate for the protection of the United States, by contract entered into with the organization concerned whereby such organization shall perform such work.

SEC. 2. This act shall be deemed a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

Approved October 7, 1949.

[Public Law 451—81st Cong.]

[Ch. 47—2d sess.]

H. R. 7220

An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the second sentence of the act entitled "An act to provide for the return of rehabilitation and better-

ment costs of Federal reclamation projects," approved October 7, 1949, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following: "except that, any such determination may become effective prior to the expiration of such 60 days in any case in which each such committee approves an earlier date and notifies the Secretary, in writing, of such approval: *Provided*, That when Congress is not in session the Secretary's determination, if accompanied by a finding by the Secretary that substantial hardship to the water users concerned or substantial further injury to the project works will result, shall become effective when the chairman and ranking minority member of each such committee shall file with the Secretary their written approval of said findings."

Approved March 3, 1950.

**AUTHORIZING CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE; AND AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, that the Clerk of the House may receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker pro tempore be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

**CANCER AND MALIGNANT NEOPLASTIC DISEASES**

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6278) to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to promulgate regulations requiring that cancer, sarcoma, lymphoma (including Hodgkin's disease), leukemia, and all other malignant growths, be reported to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The reports of cases made pursuant to the provisions of regulations promulgated under this act shall be confidential and not open to public inspection. The information in such reports shall not be divulged or made public so as to disclose the identity of any person to whom they may relate, except upon order of court. All information in such reports, or compiled from them, which does not disclose the identity of any person, may be made public only on written authorization of the Health Officer.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act or regulations promulgated thereunder shall be construed to compel any person suffering from any of the diseases listed in section 1 to submit to medical examination or treatment.

SEC. 4. The said Commissioners are authorized to prescribe a reasonable penalty or fine, not to exceed \$100, for the violation of any regulation promulgated under the authority of this act, and all prosecutions for violations of such regulations shall be in the criminal branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia upon information

filed by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia.

This it is believed will be of great value in gathering information which may be used in determining the causes, control, and treatment of such diseases. Twenty-seven States now have similar legislation.

This legislation was requested by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and was endorsed by the Health Officer of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISTRICT BOXING COMMISSIONER

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7623) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint to the District Boxing Commission a retired member of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit a retired member of the Police Department of the District of Columbia to serve as a member of the District of Columbia Boxing Commission.

This legislation would permit the retired member to reside within the District of Columbia or within the metropolitan area of the District, which is designated as an area within 12 miles of the Capitol Building.

Mr. STEFAN. That means that after a member of the police force is retired the Commissioners can bring him back in service, if he is qualified, physically fit, and so on?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is right; if he can qualify otherwise.

Mr. STEFAN. On the Boxing Commission?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Metropolitan Police force member of the Commission may be a retired member of such force; but when the office is held by such a retired member the provisions of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes,' approved May 10, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 58), shall not apply to such member, and

such member may reside within the District of Columbia or within the metropolitan area of the District not to exceed a distance of 12 miles from the United States Capitol Building."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out all of line 8 after the word "The", all of lines 9 and 10 down to and including the word "the."

On page 2, line 5, strike out "such member" and insert "a retired member of the Metropolitan Police force who is a member of the Commission."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill relating to members of the District Boxing Commission who are retired members of the Metropolitan Police Department."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REGULATING BOXING CONTESTS AND EXHIBITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7662) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize paid service of a member of the Boxing Commission while he is receiving retired pay or compensation because of previous service rendered to the United States in any branch of its armed service or to the District of Columbia. Under existing law this may not be done.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia stated in support of this bill that they were of the opinion that any person drawing pay as a retired officer of the service and who qualifies to perform duties of a member of the Boxing Commission should be permitted to receive the compensation provided by law as such member, as well as his retired pay. They hold that the one is a reward for services rendered while the other is a salary for duty performed.

Mr. TACKETT. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 823), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section: "Sec. 18. Notwithstanding the limitation of any other law or regulation to the con-

trary, any person heretofore or hereafter appointed as a member of the Commission may receive the compensation authorized by this act to be paid to such member, as well as any retired pay, retirement compensation, or annuity to which such member may be entitled on account of previous service rendered to the United States or District of Columbia governments."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPANSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATER SYSTEM

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], a member of the committee, to call up a bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8578) authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would explain this bill, because it is an entirely new departure as far as financing the District of Columbia is concerned. I think the Members should understand what it provides.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the expansion, the very necessary expansion of the water system of the District of Columbia. That system has been in use for many years and has now reached its full capacity. The bill is of an emergency character because of the fact that the consumption of water in the District of Columbia is rapidly increasing. There have been times in the very near past when the demands for water and the usage of water exceeded the capacity of the reservoirs. If this bill is passed, it will take about 3 years to complete the work that is contemplated. It is a rather major undertaking.

In order to finance it the ordinary municipality would issue bonds, but that is not possible under the set-up of the District of Columbia. Therefore, as has been done in the past, the provision is, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, that the District Commissioners may from time to time borrow the necessary money from the Treasury to complete these improvements. That money is to be borrowed on terms as to interest rates fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not a fact that this is entirely self-liquidating? That is, that the water users will pay back both principal and interest to the Federal Government?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; it will be entirely liquidated, and it will be at no cost to the Federal Government. There are further safeguards in the bill that none of this money can be borrowed or used until approved first by the budget. It is authorized in this bill. It will have to be approved year by year by



the Appropriations Committee in the consideration of the bill.

Let me add that this bill has been considered by the joint fiscal subcommittee of the Senate and the House. It was unanimously approved by that subcommittee and has been unanimously approved by the full Senate District Committee and has been unanimously approved by the full House District Committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the condition of the water revolving fund now?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. STEFAN. What is the condition of the funds in the water department at the present time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I could not give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the status of it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not sure that I know what the gentleman is asking about.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is no revolving fund now. Congress gives the District of Columbia a million dollars a year to pay for the water that we use. However, a metering of the water shows that the Federal Government actually uses \$1,200,000 worth of water each year; in other words, there is \$200,000 that the Federal Government uses for which the District is not reimbursed. That is a fixed sum that we appropriate each year for water use; that is supposed to pay for all the water used by the Federal Government.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that. What I want to know is what the condition of the Treasury is so far as the water fund is concerned today. How much money do they have on hand? And how much do they contemplate borrowing if this bill is passed? It is a far-reaching measure and a lot of consideration should be given to it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. A lot of consideration has been given to it, I can assure the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How much is it contemplated borrowing?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Twenty-three million dollars over a period of 10 years. That is specified in the bill. It will come before the gentleman's committee for approval each year, and the money cannot be spent until the gentleman's committee approves it.

Mr. STEFAN. It can only be spent when the committee approves it, but I think this thing is so far-reaching that we ought to go into it at some length and debate it today, because the water service here originally belonged to the Federal Government. It was given to the District of Columbia. Since that time there have been considerable improvements. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] said that the Government uses a million and a quarter dollars' worth of water every year. If we do not pay for all we use, I think we

should. But I think we should have some consideration here as to exactly what we are doing. How is this fund going to be administered? What changes are going to be made? What is the situation with reference to collections? I understand they are failing behind in their collections.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will ask his questions one at a time, I will do my feeble best to answer them. But I do want to say to the gentleman that this matter has been given full and complete consideration by two subcommittees; we have had full hearings on the matter, and then had another hearing before the full House District Committee, and I assume they had some hearings before the full Senate committee.

Mr. STEFAN. I will ask the gentleman from Virginia how is this \$23,000,000 going to be expended? How is it going to operate? What is the interest rate going to be on it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The rate will be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. STEFAN. Why is the amount fixed at \$23,000,000?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Because that is the estimate of the amount required. The District Commissioners have made very elaborate estimates of costs.

Mr. STEFAN. And this money is to be used for further expanding the water system of the District of Columbia, which is growing so rapidly, is it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the condition as to receipts from water collections?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There are about \$2,000,000 every year that can be used for capital improvements and for liquidating this necessary expenditure.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there enough in collections to make some expansion?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They have made some expansions in the past.

Mr. STEFAN. But is the condition such that the collections do not allow the necessary expansion?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not the necessary expansion of this magnitude. That is the reason this bill is here.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know anything about the collections for water use? Are they in arrears on collections?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The testimony I have is that they are not in arrears on collections except to a very minor extent. The testimony was that they lose only about \$1,000 a year on water collections.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia, does the District of Columbia Water Department furnish water to any parts of Virginia or Maryland?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Both. They furnish water at a rental that is fixed by an act of Congress.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TACKETT. If this bill is considered under the present procedure to-

day, will there be an opportunity to debate the issues involved?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If unanimous consent is granted for consideration of the bill, it will be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, as used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

(b) "District of Columbia water system" or "water system" means any and all of the facilities used or to be used for the supply of raw or partly purified water wherever situated and all of the facilities used or to be used for the distribution of purified water situated within the District of Columbia which are operated by the District of Columbia Water Division or the Washington Aqueduct Division of the Washington District of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or both.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to accept loans for the District of Columbia from the United States Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby authorized to lend to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, such sums as may hereafter be appropriated, to finance the expansion and improvement of the water system when sufficient funds therefor are not available from the District of Columbia water fund established by law (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, title 43, ch. 15): *Provided*, That the total principal amount of loans made under the provisions of this section shall not exceed \$23,000,000: *And provided further*, That a loan for use in any fiscal year must first be specifically requested of the Congress in connection with the budget submitted for the District of Columbia for that fiscal year, with a full statement of the work contemplated to be done and the need thereof, and must be specifically approved by the Congress. Such loans shall be in addition to any other loans heretofore or hereafter made to the Commissioners for any other purpose, and when advanced shall be deposited in full in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the said District of Columbia water fund.

(b) The loans authorized under this section, or any parts thereof, shall be advanced to the Commissioners on their requisitions therefor and shall be available to the Commissioners or the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, for the performance of the said expansion and improvement of the water system, and shall be available until expended.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall be repaid any moneys advanced under this section of this act, including interest thereon, beginning in fiscal year 1961 and concluding in fiscal year 1980, in such annual amounts as the Congress shall hereafter direct; interest thereon shall begin to accrue as of the dates the respective advancements are credited to the water fund.

(d) Loans made under this section shall be at such rate or rates of interest as would, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be the lowest interest rate available to the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of each loan, respectively, were said District authorized by law to issue and sell obligations to the public, at the par value thereof, in a sum or sums equal to the amounts of such loans, maturing serially over a comparable period of years in comparable installments of principal and interest, and secured by a first pledge of and lien upon all the general fund revenues of said District.

(e) Moneys for the payments to the United States Treasury herein required shall be included in the budget estimates of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, beginning with the budget estimates for fiscal year 1961, and shall be payable from the water fund.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, most of the membership of this Congress comes from various towns that have in the past and are willing today to donate water, buildings, or anything else in order to bring some industry to their respective communities. Many cities and towns throughout the United States daily advertise their anxiety to have big payrolls brought into their communities.

Washington, D. C., has been brought into existence—the great beautiful city it is—by virtue of the Federal payroll which is dished out every week. Just imagine what your towns and your cities and your counties and your States would give for the opportunity of having within their midst the Federal Government payroll as here in Washington. If the people of the District of Columbia paid the taxes that they do in my towns, in my counties, and in my State—you can say they do and I will say they do not—they would have a lot more to grumble about than they have to talk about today.

If your cities want to build a water-supply unit of some kind, do they come to the Federal Government and ask for a special loan to do this? Of course, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] will insist that the District of Columbia does not have authority to act upon revenue-raising matters as your respective localities. But I want to ask the proponents of this bill why is it necessary for the people in the District of Columbia or the Government to extend its projects all over the country around the District of Columbia to take care of people who are not citizens of the District of Columbia?

This bill is not only to take care of the District of Columbia. It is to take care of Maryland, it is to take care of Virginia, it is to take care of the people who are near but outside the District of Columbia, who cannot get their fingers in the pie in any other way. That is what it means.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The testimony this morning before our committee was to the effect that the average amount of daily use of water in the District is 180,000,000 gallons. Of that amount Virginia uses about 7,000,000 gallons and Maryland about 1,000,000 gallons, for which they pay.

I agree with the gentleman, I think the fiscal arrangement and the District Water Board ought to be set up on a business basis whereby they will have a revolving fund, a replacement fund, a depreciation fund, and so forth. It must be understood, though, that the District officials are so circumscribed by Congress that they are not able to issue bonds. On one day last summer we had a demand on the water system for 240,000,-

000 gallons. The system is only set up to furnish 175,000,000 gallons per day. This coming summer we may be short of water.

Mr. TACKETT. Right there, please, let me ask this question.

I will admit that the District of Columbia has such a procedural set-up that it cannot issue bonds as other cities, but is there anything to prohibit the Virginia areas about Alexandria and all these other areas across the river from issuing bonds to take care of their own water supply?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman that there should not be any selling of water to both Virginia or Maryland.

Mr. TACKETT. Knowing how conservative the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is, can you imagine him getting up on the floor of this House and asking for a loan for Arkansas to get a water supply? No, you cannot. He would oppose the expenditure of a penny of this Federal Government except when it is for Alexandria and places within Virginia about Washington, D. C. He has bitterly protested practically all such Federal Government expenditures save and except moneys being dished out within and about his area.

Gentlemen, it is easy to be a conservative when the measure only affects the people of the other fellow's district. If that be the proper procedure there will be but one or two votes for this bill.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the District of Columbia cannot borrow money like an ordinary municipality.

Mr. TACKETT. I admit that.

Mr. BEALL. The only way they can get that money is from the Federal Government. And, the users of this water are going to pay for it; they are not only going to pay back the original investment, but the interest as well.

Mr. TACKETT. I will go along with you on the District of Columbia loan, but let us confine the loan to the District of Columbia. That is as far as you have any right, under your argument, to progress.

Mr. BEALL. But the States of Maryland and Virginia pay for that water.

Mr. TACKETT. Oh, they pay for that water, but at a better rate than the people removed from this area are afforded. We have a few Federal projects out in Arkansas, but we are never given the consideration being daily afforded the District of Columbia. Here everything is for the District of Columbia. We would pay the water bill for the National Capital payroll down in my State. We would donate most of the contentions of the District of Columbia for the payroll afforded the District by virtue of the National Capital.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The difficulty with that is that Arkansas is too far

away to do that, but they really ought to move the Capital down there.

Mr. TACKETT. It ought to be there. We would at least show our appreciation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman may not recall it, but the Congress itself passed legislation which made it possible for Virginia and Maryland to get a certain amount of water, including these border-line cases near the District of Columbia. I think it was in 1928 when that was done. So, if you want to change it, it ought to be done by law. I agree with the gentleman, and I said so in the committee this morning. Virginia and Maryland only get about 8,000,000 gallons out of 180,000,000 gallons a day. It is a small amount. The boundaries are fixed, but there are certain houses along the border line where it is convenient to tap in. But, that practice should not be enlarged, and I would support legislation to deny them any water supply from the District of Columbia. But, the territories are so entwined that it was found necessary to pass this legislation, and this Congress more than 20 years ago passed legislation permitting that to be done.

Mr. TACKETT. May I ask the gentleman this question? How much of this \$22,000,000 is going to be used within the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. All of it.

Mr. TACKETT. How much of it is going to be used outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It will all be used in the District of Columbia for developing a water supply on the Potomac River.

Mr. TACKETT. But that water is going to be transported over to and become a benefit to other localities outside of the District of Columbia, is it not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. An average of 8,000,000 out of 180,000,000 gallons daily. That is a very small amount. Of course, it might develop that there would be a lack of water, just like there was in New York City and other large cities this year, and unless we develop a sufficient water supply, we might find ourselves in danger. This system is outmoded now. The demand in the last 10 years has more than tripled, and they expect in 10 years to have another doubling of the use of the water.

Mr. TACKETT. Is there any way for the District of Columbia to provide a water supply without the enactment of this legislation?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not believe there is. I questioned the bill very closely in committee. I was opposed to it at first. I felt that the Water Commissioners should set up a revolving fund and a replacement fund, but they have not done it.

Mr. TACKETT. Could they not do that and build their own system?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; if they had started that procedure 20 years ago. I think from here on they will.

Mr. TACKETT. I disagree with the gentleman, because as long as they can get their fingers in the Government till, they will not do anything.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They will have to pay this \$22,000,000 back with



interest. The water rates will pay it back to the Federal Government. It is not costing the taxpayers any money. Unless we do this, one of these good, hot summer days we are going to find out we have no water in the District of Columbia, just as they did in the city of New York.

Mr. TACKETT. Is there any other way they can borrow money? Can they not get the money through private loans?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not unless we pass legislation allowing it.

Mr. TACKETT. Why do we not pass that legislation instead of allowing them to borrow from the Federal Government, when your towns and my towns cannot borrow from the Federal Government?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We brought that up in the committee. I thought the best way to do it was to borrow from private concerns, but they would probably have to pay a little more interest. I would agree with the gentleman that they should borrow from private concerns, but it would take special legislation to do that.

Mr. TACKETT. This is special legislation. It does not take any longer to get a bill through allowing private enterprise to survive in this country than it does to allow those who happen to live in the District of Columbia and thereabouts to borrow from the Federal Government. That is absolutely contrary to our principles of operation. It does give the District and the people around the District an opportunity that your towns and my towns do not have the right to enjoy.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Does not the gentleman know that his own small cities can sell their bonds to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and thus borrow from the Government?

Mr. TACKETT. They can borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation if a private lending company does not want to take the loan?

Mr. LANHAM. You can borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for your cities to extend their waterworks, because we have done it in our city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. It is true that the city in which I happen live in the State of Arkansas can borrow money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation if they cannot get it from any other loan institution, but they must come forth with ample evidence that they cannot borrow it from another institution. However, under the provisions of this bill it is not necessary for you even to ask for a loan from a private institution. You just come straight to the Government

and get the money, \$22,000,000 over a period of 10 years. I just do not think it is right. I think there should be a proviso of some kind, special legislation or otherwise, that would make the cities about the District of Columbia follow the same practices that are followed all over the United States of America.

I will admit the District of Columbia is operating under different procedures than towns elsewhere operate, but I think that this is a discriminatory bill and is not justified unless they cannot get the money from any other source. There has been no proof to that effect, except that under the laws governing the District of Columbia you cannot issue bonds without special legislation. I think we should have special legislation—that would not take over 15 or 20 minutes of the time of the Congress to pass—which would allow them to borrow their money from some other source—from private enterprise—that is paying the taxes of this country.

You say this is not costing the taxpayers anything. That is just where you are wrong. It is costing the taxpayers money every time a dollar goes out of the tills of the Treasury because the interest rate is going to be so much lower—lower than the Federal Government can borrow. You know that. That is exactly the reason the people are here and do not want to borrow the money from private enterprise. They want the lowest possible rate of interest. They want to be in a position where, if they do not repay it, nothing will be done about it.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the District of Columbia gets its water from Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; I know that.

Mr. BEALL. It comes from the Potomac River, and the Potomac River is in Maryland.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; and every penny of the money spent here is going to help other localities as much as the District of Columbia.

Mr. BEALL. But Maryland and Virginia pay for everything they get.

Mr. TACKETT. They pay for it, but they do not have to pay for it like other people all over the country.

Mr. BEALL. They certainly do.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman made the statement that this money would be borrowed from the Government at a lower rate of interest than the Government itself would have to borrow it. We had General Young, one of the Commissioners, before the committee and asked him that specific question. He said it would not be borrowed from the Government at a lower rate than the Government itself pays to borrow money.

Mr. TACKETT. Did he indicate what the rate of interest would be?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It would be something in the neighborhood of 2 or 2½ percent. I do not know the exact

amount, but he made the specific statement that it would not be borrowed at a lower rate of interest than the Government itself pays on borrowed money.

Mr. TACKETT. That is a pretty high rate of interest. The State of Arkansas sold some highway bonds recently a great deal cheaper than that. I know that they do not have the security that the Federal Government has. There is no way in the world that you can lose any money on a loan like this. Twenty-two million dollars at 2½ percent is pretty high.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. But this money would not be borrowed all at one time.

Mr. TACKETT. That is correct. It would be borrowed over a 10-year period, as they need it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. TACKETT. Now, you gentlemen can vote as you see fit. I am sure it is not going to hurt you one bit politically regardless of how you vote. But if you are honest with yourselves, you know I am right on this issue. You can do what you want to about it, but I say there should be a bill here to provide that if they cannot get the money first from private enterprise, then they can come back and get it from the Federal Government just as your cities and my cities have to do.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with what the gentleman said relative to borrowing from private sources. I wish that were possible. I think it would take some amending of the law in a good many places. It could not be done by just a simple bill. Also, I would go along with the thought that we ought to furnish the minimum amount of service to Maryland and Virginia and not expand that service. I understand we are not expanding the service. But we are faced with the cold, hard facts that within the next few years, unless we get an adequate water supply, and we have it in the Potomac River, piped into the city of Washington we are going to find days when we will not have enough water to supply the citizens here.

This money will be paid back with interest, otherwise I would not support it under any circumstances.

Mr. TACKETT. Let me say one thing to the gentleman. It is these little steps that we take every day which are driving private enterprise out of this country and socializing our economy. It is these little steps that we take that are bringing these conditions about. "Oh," they say, "this one does not amount to anything, and the other one does not amount to anything."

But I venture to say that if this bill goes through, it is not going to be long before every big city in the country is going to ask for the same legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] will remain in the Chamber, because I think he is under some misapprehension about this bill. I appreciate his deep interest in the Federal Treasury and in the District

of Columbia. Of course, I know he is deeply interested in the State of Arkansas, and Arkansas ought to be proud of him because he looks after them all the time here. I do not know why he ought to blame me for trying to look out for Virginia, and Alexandria a little bit, and I do not think he does. I think he appreciates my position on that. However, I do want to correct this misapprehension on the part of the gentleman from Arkansas in case the same misapprehension has found a place in the minds of other Members.

He indicated that this is largely for the benefit of the city of Alexandria. I want to say to the House that the city of Alexandria has its own adequate water supply. We have an older water-supply system than the District of Columbia. We do not get a drop of water from the District of Columbia system and never expect to, because we have an adequate supply of good, pure water of our own.

Now, Arlington County does get some water, and they pay for it. They do not pay for it what Arlington wants to pay. They pay the sum that this Congress has fixed that they must pay. It is fixed by law. The gentleman from Arkansas was here when this Congress passed the bill that authorized these outlying territories to purchase water from the District of Columbia water system. Why? There are several reasons why. One is that a large number of the members of the Federal Administration reside in those outlying areas. More of them come to reside there every year. I do not know how many, but my guess would be that at least 40 or 50 Members of this very House itself live over on the Virginia side of the river and must have that water if they want to take a bath in the morning. In addition to that, the Government built the great Pentagon Building on the Virginia side—a tremendous consumer of water. The Government has Fort Myer over on the Virginia side. The Government has the Navy annex on the Virginia side. It was absolutely necessary as a matter of Government policy and as a matter of national defense that those mains should be extended over there. None of this money will go into the improvement of the water systems of Virginia or Maryland. It is all being spent on the reservoirs in Washington. Every pipeline that is laid on the Virginia side or the Maryland side is laid by those communities themselves. The Government does not pay 1 cent of it. All that happens to the Government is that you get so much per thousand gallons for the water, so you put back into the Treasury the money for that water which would otherwise just run down the river and you would not get anything for it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Has the gentleman any reply to the charge that this is socialistic legislation? The gentleman's reputation in support of socialistic legislation makes me suspect, when he comes in here and proposes legislation of this kind. I would like to hear what he has to say about that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not want to reply to any personal allusions at this time. I am always ready to defend my record at an appropriate time, but I do not wish to be diverted from the task of clearing up any objections to the passage of this bill. I am sympathetically aware of the necessity of some Members in election years to make speeches that will be pleasing to the good folks at home, and in that spirit I am happy to be of service to my good friend from Arkansas, in furnishing a target for his remarks.

But let us get down to the merits of this problem. This city is governed by this Congress. There are a few of us who have the disagreeable duty of having to sit as a city council for the District of Columbia. I wish the gentleman from Arkansas would get on that committee. He would be a very valuable member. I would like to see him on that committee. There are usually vacancies on it, and I would like to see the gentleman there to help us work out these problems that are not really the business of our constituencies, but we do it as a public service. When we come in here with a bill you may be assured that we come after the most thorough and meticulous consideration of the problem involved.

The District of Columbia cannot borrow any money in the open market. The Congress has prohibited that. The gentleman from Arkansas never offered any bill to give this city home rule or to give this city the power to borrow money or to do the things that normal cities do. So the only way this city can get the necessary money for capital improvements is through this type of loan. The provision is that it can only get it after it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, then after it has gone to the Appropriations Committee and has been considered by the Appropriations Committee as to how much is needed, and then only when the Secretary of the Treasury fixes the rate of interest and the return date of payment. I just wonder what more the District Committee of the Senate or the District Committee of the House could have done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is easy to complain about the way things are done or the way they are not done, but I would like to have some constructive suggestions about what we ought to do. We are not particularly interested in District legislation. We are just trying to do a job that somebody in this Congress has to do. This city has to make improvements. This is where you men have to come and live when you are in Congress. We are just trying to help you along. If the gentleman has any constructive suggestion about it, we would be glad to listen. We have done the best we could with this thing, we

have done the best we could after ample and thorough study, and I hope the House will agree to go along with us on this measure, because this is rather an emergency situation, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has pointed out. Last year with a normal capacity of 175,000,000 gallons a day, for several days they had to produce 240,000,000 gallons. That cannot keep up, and that situation is getting worse. The reason we bring this to you and ask you to act on it today is so they can get this additional supply that is so necessary, and that it may go forward at once, because the testimony is that it is going to take 3 years to do this job after we get the authority.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. Do the people living in Virginia and Maryland pay the same rate for water as they do in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; the municipalities over there buy it wholesale at a rate fixed by Congress. They buy it wholesale at the Washington line. They put in all the distributing systems.

Mr. HEDRICK. Do I understand that it is much cheaper than in other cities of the country?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; the testimony was that the rate in Washington is just about the average with comparable large cities in the country.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. I have four towns in my district that want water and I have one town in my district, a pretty good-sized town, that cannot even borrow money to build a sewer system. I wonder if the gentleman would be pleased to support legislation that would give my city the opportunity to borrow money from the Federal Government to construct these needed water and sewer improvements.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have already done so; I have already supported legislation for the RFC. They have ample power to lend that money to the cities in Arkansas if the security is there and the loan is sound; and I am sure they will; the gentleman might bend his energies in that direction, rather than in opposing constructive legislation for the Nation's Capital.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2440) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval in-



stallations, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, KILDAY, SHORT, and ARENS.

#### BRIDGE OVER ANACOSTIA RIVER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7341) to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Anacostia River in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "line" and insert "vicinity."

Page 2, line 2, after "act.", insert "The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are further authorized and directed to proceed to acquire sufficient land along, or in close proximity to, Kenilworth Avenue in the District of Columbia, for a right-of-way of adequate width for the construction of a controlled access road to interconnect the Washington-Annapolis Freeway and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway with said bridge and its east approaches at or near the point where Kenilworth Avenue, if extended, would intersect said bridge and its east approaches."

Page 3, line 14, after "Commission" insert "and the Commission of Fine Arts."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is unanimous agreement in this matter?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes; that is quite clear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FIVE-DAY WEEK FOR OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE, THE UNITED STATES PARK POLICE FORCE, AND THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE FORCE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7695) to provide a 5-day week for officers

and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what this bill does.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to place the Metropolitan Police force, the White House Police force and the United States Park Police force on a 5-day week. The 5-day week is now in operation in police departments in many cities in the United States; among these being Detroit, Mich.; Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif.; Columbus, Ohio; Jersey City, N. J.; Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; and a number of others.

Here in the District of Columbia practically every Federal employee is on a 5-day week except the police force. The police department is having trouble in keeping its personnel up to the necessary and required standard. It holds examinations. It goes out and undertakes to get young men as recruits of the right type and kind of people to make good police officers. These young men come in and investigate, see what the pay is and the various things connected with the work, but when they get to the 6-day week they say: "No, I can do better than that in the Civil Service, the Post Office Department, the Census Bureau, and other places."

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not a fact the House passed this same bill 2 years ago?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I understand the House did 2 years ago, although I was not a member of the committee at that time.

Mr. BEALL. I introduced the same bill in the Eightieth Congress and we passed it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized on this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the unanimous-consent request is granted, the bill will then be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) every officer and member of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force shall be granted two consecutive days off in each period of 7 days, which shall be in addition to the annual leave and sick leave to which he is entitled by law.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), whenever the Commissioners of the District of Columbia declare that an emergency exists of such a character as to require the continuous service of all officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, it shall be the duty of the major and superintendent of police to suspend and discontinue the

granting of such 2 days off in seven during the continuation of such emergency.

(c) Notwithstanding subsection (a), whenever the Secretary of the Interior declares that an emergency exists of such a character as to require the continuous service of all officers and members of the United States Park Police force, it shall be the duty of the Superintendent of National Capital Parks to suspend and discontinue the granting of such 2 days off in seven during the continuation of such emergency.

(d) Notwithstanding subsection (a), whenever the Chief of the Secret Service Division finds that an emergency exists of such a character as to require the continuous service of all officers and members of the White House Police force, he shall suspend and discontinue the granting of such 2 days off in seven during the continuation of such emergency.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1950.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "consecutive."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, my information now is that this bill was passed in the Eightieth Congress, therefore it must be all right. That may or it may not be a sound reason. Here is the point I desire to make. I have the utmost confidence in the judgment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. He states this bill is necessary in order to keep the number of policemen here, that when they come and look the situation over and learn what the pay is they do not want a job. Am I correct on that?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The pay is not so objectionable. It is the number of hours. The major of police said that they lose good men they need and that they would get a lot of men, and good ones, but when they get down to the hours and days of work and they see that there is not the provision which all of the other Government and Federal employees have, they will not take the job.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If that be true—and I assume it is, otherwise the major would not have stated it and the gentleman would not have repeated it—it seems to set a rather bad example. I understood the gentleman to say that practically all Federal employees were on a 5-day week. Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is my understanding. May I say to the gentleman that I feel the same way about that, but I did not start the 5-day week. This is the situation in which the police department finds itself. The 5-day week is here and the police department must compete with other departments in getting their employees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will have a great deal of difficulty in explaining to my constituents, or at least 30 percent of them who are farmers and who do not have, never have had, and never expect to have a 5-day week. It will be difficult to explain why the Federal Government should set a 5-day week

for its employees, while the people who pay them must work 6 days a week and an 8-hour day. If the police are not getting enough money, if we are not paying them a sufficient amount, let us pay them more. In spite of all improvement in production, in spite of all the new methods that have been brought about, and in spite of the new ways of doing things, in spite of the fact we get much more now in 3 days per week production than we used to get in 7, still, sometime, somewhere, somebody must work if we are to get along. There seems to be no short magic way of tilling the soil and getting production back home without work.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in that connection I want to say that I see the gentleman from Michigan coming in here in the morning and leaving late at night, as he sees me doing the same thing, and I do not have the benefit of a 5-day week any more than the gentleman from Michigan has. However, this situation here was testified to in great detail by the police authorities and by the District Commissioners, and it is an actual situation that we face, and regardless of how much we dislike it, we do know that we must have police protection here in the city.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I assume the gentleman is trying to tell me that neither he nor I can do anything about the 5-day week. That is what it amounts to, is it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am just telling the gentleman about the difficulties encountered.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. What the gentleman from Michigan says is true. I think the Members of Congress are in the same category that the farmers of this Nation are. We work not 5 days a week, but 7 days a week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of us.

Mr. SHORT. Well, practically all of us do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; I will accept the blanket endorsement. I think all the Congressmen agree that they are some of the hardest working people in the country; at least it would be natural for us to think we work much of the time.

Mr. SHORT. Seven days a week, and not 8 hours a day either.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this to the gentleman from Michigan that we, like our farmers, work 7 days a week but not 8 hours a day.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many?

Mr. SHORT. Well, I will let the gentleman testify for himself. I know how diligent and assiduous he is in his arduous labors. Most of us work from 12 to 16 hours a day.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I was only as eloquent as the gentleman from Missouri, I would be all right.

Mr. SHORT. Just a moment. You are all right. I have the floor. I refuse to yield further to the gentleman. This legislation does not establish a precedent. The precedent already has been established, and certainly the gentleman is not going to object to giving the policemen in the District of Columbia the same consideration and fair treatment—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That I expect from them.

Mr. SHORT. That we give other employees of the Federal Government. I think this is meritorious legislation and that it should be passed. We passed it in the Eighteenth Congress which was Republican controlled.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do they vote in our district?

Mr. SHORT. That I do not know. I think many of them do. It matters not because we should show a little appreciation or consideration of the policemen of Washington in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to read a telegram addressed to the Speaker of the House, and signed by James P. Wesberry, former Acting Chaplain of the House of Representatives:

I had the great honor today of nominating Brooks Hays as second vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention which is meeting in Chicago with some 10,000 members attending. He was duly elected. This is a great spiritual honor and responsibility. The convention, as you know, represents over 28,000 churches with about 7,000,000 members. His friends in Congress will rejoice.

With deep appreciation personally,  
JAMES P. WESBERRY.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, all of us appreciate this recognition and honor that has come to our colleague.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. CLEMENTE), for May 25, on account of official business.

To Mr. WAGNER, for 1 day, on account of serious illness in family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARE (at the request of Mr. McMillan of South Carolina) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he delivered.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (at the request of Mr. Lovre) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADOWSKI (at the request of Mr. RABAUT) was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next and on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, how else are you going to deliver a Memorial Day speech unless you walk in like this and ask for the time? Nobody has invited me to speak on Memorial Day. This is what I would deliver if I had been asked to deliver a Memorial Day speech.

As we strew with flowers the graves of those to whom freedom and liberty meant more than life, let us on Memorial Day pray with the poet—

Wake in our breasts the living fires,  
The holy faith that warmed our sires;  
Thy hand hath made our Nation free;  
To die for her is serving Thee.

In doing honor to the memory of those men and women who, by their sacrifices, call to our attention that true liberty is beyond price, let us recognize that to such Americans as they the flowers and the flags will be but empty tribute



if we fail to rededicate our hearts and minds to those sublime truths which they held so dear.

This country was founded on faith, not fear. And that faith of our fathers was a wholesome thing. It was a faith in God—a faith that right makes might. It was the faith that casts out fear. It was at once our refuge and our strength.

Our fighting forces won the war. That was in 1945. In this year 1950, those hopes that were high in the fall of 1945 have been dashed by recent developments. Our diplomacy has nullified our victory. If there is any lesson this state of affairs should teach, it is the fallibility of man, and the mistake of placing our faith in things material. As a nation, even as individuals, we have come to assume that the dollar is the answer to all problems, and our diplomats seek to cement the victory won by our armed forces with cash, while peace terms remain unwritten.

Many of us have reached an age where we frequently may be heard to say, "I'll never live to see" certain things come to pass. Many will not live to see another war. More will not live to see the world at peace, even temporarily. But to all of us who have children or grandchildren the future of this country is a matter of grave concern. Normal adults are not easily influenced by the un-Godly and Godless teachings of those who have been referred to as social coercionists. But the youngsters of our Nation must be saved from the subversive efforts of the planners and plotters, and the strange and alien philosophies that have been allowed to take root in our schools and our Government since the beginning of the century must be weeded out by our homes and churches. More alarming than the knowledge that others possess the secret of the atom bomb is the record of failure to stockpile spiritual resources.

We have more houses than in 1900, but fewer homes.

We have better school buildings, but no greater wisdom.

We have labor- and time-saving devices unknown 50 years ago, but find no more opportunity to be with our children.

We have gained in pecuniary wealth and lost in sense of values.

Let us teach our children what our parents taught us—that life is not a gift but a loan, and that faith and freedom come as the result of study and work, as do most worth-while things of life. A prudent jealousy for our freedom is a healthy thing. Because of his strength, speed, grace of motion, sense of direction, and lack of fear—which enable him to cruise the airways freely—the eagle is the symbol of our country. Powerful wings lift him to the heights to which neither man nor eagle may reach without freedom. Injury to one of those powerful wings upsets the bird's equilibrium, cuts his speed, makes his motions awkward. So with our Government.

In recent years great emphasis has been put on the left wing. Now, if too much pressure is applied to the eagle's

left wing, one of two things occurs—he turns bottom side up or he revolves in circles. If assured against pursuit by other denizens of the air—if promised food will be his without his hunting—if necessity for exercise of initiative and responsibility is absent, he will become like a parrot. Confined in a cage—perhaps chained to a perch—he is saved all worry as to sustenance, but that freedom to coast on the wind and flaunt his speed and strength he has exchanged for the certainty of applause when he jeers the family cat, and a cracker when he whistles.

We frequently hear complaints that one is too conservative, or, let us say, too far to the right. But so long as there are those elements in our country—in schools and in government—so very far to the left, just so long will it be necessary to work hard at keeping our country, like the eagle, in balance.

It has been said that a mother is not one on whom to lean, but one who makes leaning unnecessary. One who leans, whether on a parent or on a government, soon loses the ability to walk alone, and the increasing tendency of individuals to resort to the state for aid and guidance in solving personal problems, like the Government's assumption of omnipotence and omniscience is fast leading us down the road to a chaos of financial and moral bankruptcy.

Those founding fathers who fought in 1776 knew poverty and suffering. That the system they established had imperfections they realized. But they had a consuming desire to insure the freedom of the individual to manage and improve his own private affairs—to worship God in his own way—to keep the reins of government in his own hands. That even our country would never be altogether free of poverty, unhappiness, and suffering they knew, but they knew too that poverty, unhappiness, and suffering are comparative terms. And history, of course, discounted the idea that man-made government could cure all man-made ills.

Thousands of volunteers in the last century and a half have found the things their forebears stood for worth defending, and millions of people from the Old World continue to beseech admission at our national doors, like small boys trying to crawl under the tent of the greatest show on earth.

There is not a man or woman in America who is not concerned with the public welfare. There is a growing tendency to standardize it, however. Pursuit of happiness as an occupation seldom leads to mental, moral, or economic security. That persons who stay on his job, doing it as best he may, saves the necessary energy to grasp happiness when it overtakes him. What the ultra-liberal conceives to be the ingredients of happiness and welfare he would have the Government undertake to furnish each citizen. Material things all! A balanced diet, including spinach and carrots—which few crave—a modern home, with hot and cold running water, garbage disposal unit, so many cubic feet space per person, and a nearby super-

vised playground for children, with free motor transportation to schools presided over by teachers with college degrees. All this as insurance of health, welfare, and happiness.

It reminds me of a broadcast to which I listened recently, where success was discussed. Amazingly, everyone on the panel thought of success only in terms of material things. Is it then surprising that our mental institutions are full of frustrated souls, and our streets gloomy with wrinkled foreheads and black-rimmed eyes?

What are our parents, teachers, and churches teaching?

As parents we fail to instill the faith of our fathers, to give our children a true sense of value.

As teachers we urge education as a means to higher earning power, but neglect to point out another measure of success.

Our churches too often neglect the fundamental truths for sociological discussions.

Contracts, whether between man and wife, labor and industry, individuals or governments, are honored when it appears profitable, and too frequently bribery rather than diplomacy becomes the instrument of negotiations between countries. The result of all this is loss of respect for and faith in humanity. Somewhere along the way we have not been given access to fresh stores of faith at which to replenish the losses incident to ordinary living.

Do not let anyone convince us that all is well; that the state of the Union is good; that what we need is socialized medicine, free trade, more Federal aid for local undertakings and economic and arms assistance to foreign countries to insure so-called public welfare. Socialized medicine has been tried in Britain and has failed miserably from every standpoint. It would fare no better here.

Lack of tariffs to protect our products produced by highly paid workers from competition of imports is already threatening employment in agriculture and fisheries, and in our shoe, cotton, and pulp industries. Greater Federal aid to States that are as well or better able to furnish the money means greater taxes, debt, and inflation. And the billions we have sent and continue to pour into foreign countries make us no friends.

Ten out of twelve persons today would give as their chief cause of worry the threat to world peace. Their mental health is disturbed because of the seeming lack of moral health throughout the globe.

So I respectfully suggest that this coming week we take time to do something other than wave flags and make speeches in memory of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. That their sacrifices may not have been in vain, let us face the facts.

These United States support a national debt so colossal that it is beyond our ability to visualize such a sum.

The country staggers under a budget so huge it requires deficit spending, although there is no shooting war.

Under the guise of seeking our welfare there are influences ceaselessly working to take from us the privilege and right of spending our own earnings.

On the local level, any attempt to ferret out disloyalty is thwarted by the calling out of all the forces of Government to discredit those who seek to make our country secure.

Respect for our flag is at such low ebb that our airplanes are shot from the skies and our protests are disregarded. And those who accept our funds, rightly refuse to honor those who would put a cash price on the great intangibles—love, loyalty, liberty, faith, truth, friendship.

If those boys and girls whose fine bodies and high hearts today rest beneath the new green of waving grass and the bright stripes and stars of their country's flag were here today, I sincerely believe they would warn us: "Each to your battle station. Take up your burden. Assume your allotted task. Seek the truth that you may meet the somber challenge crowding down upon you from every corner of the country and every spot upon the globe. Your material world will crash about you unless there is a rededication to the sublime truths on which our great Nation was founded."

It was Jesus who said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

It was someone else within recent years who said, "Who keeps the truth from the people stands in the way of God."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JENISON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### LOUIS DOLIVET

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly an anticlimax to stand up here in the well and follow such an inspiring address as we have just had the privilege of hearing with the factual presentation I have before me. Perhaps the inspiring words of the gentleman from Maine may all the more apply to the matter which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that there is pending before the Bureau of Immigration a very unusual application for American citizenship. I want to call it to the special attention of my colleagues and to the Bureau in the hope that a very thorough investigation and hearing will be given the application of this man before any action is taken. It is also to be assumed that the State Department would be interested in going very thoroughly into his background and past activities and avail itself of the considerable dossier believed to be in the FBI files. For the benefit of my colleagues, I should like to give a brief résumé of the information I have been able to obtain about this petitioner.

On June 11, 1946, Louis Dolivet made application for American citizenship under section 701 of the Nationality Act of 1940 as amended, termination date of which has been extended several times. As you know, this act permitted the naturalization of aliens who had been in the

United States and served honorably with the Armed Forces, without declaration of intention, without certificate of arrival, without specified residence in the United States. Petition for citizenship under this section had to be accompanied by the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each such witness personally knew the petitioner to be a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States. Military service could be proved by either affidavits of two United States citizens who were former members of the Armed Forces, or by authenticated copies of the record of the executive department having jurisdiction of the petitioner's record.

Let me tell you something about Louis Dolivet, who still wants to become an American citizen under this law. On October 8, 1943, he was inducted into the Army while in this country on a temporary visitor's visa. On that same day he was transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps. On October 29, 1943, he reported for active duty. Less than a month later, on November 23, 1943, he was discharged from the Army. Since he has based his application for citizenship on this 25 days' service, it is to be presumed he was given an honorable discharge. However, I have been unable to find this out, nor why during wartime, he was given an honorable discharge after such short service.

Mr. Dolivet's two witnesses who attested to his good moral character are listed with the Bureau of Immigration as Jackson Leighton, assistant publisher, 71 Washington Place, New York City, and his then wife, Beatrice S. Dolivet, Old Applegreen, Old Waterbury, N. Y. As provided in section 701, they had to swear that they knew of his good moral character, that he was attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and that he was well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States. So far as I have been able to ascertain from the Bureau of Immigration, no investigation has yet been made as to the credibility of these two witnesses. However, in view of his record which I shall touch upon, undoubtedly they should be questioned. Also, Mrs. Dolivet may not be so positive as to his character at this time, since she divorced him in Reno on May 24, 1949.

It might be interesting at this point to note that Mr. Dolivet has been in and out of this country innumerable times, and until October 13, 1947, always on visitor's visas. This has been true at least from July 1941, when he was noted by the New York Times as speaking to the International Free World Association, and at the time of his marriage to Beatrice Whitney Straight in February 1942, he was mentioned by the New York Times as being secretary general of that organization, as well as the coeditor of its magazine, the Free World. However, on October 13, 1947, he changed his status, and from that time has gone to and fro as a United Nations official with diplomatic immunity.

At the present time, Mr. Dolivet is not only accredited to the United Nations, but he is international editor and a member of the board of directors of the United Nations World, formerly the Free World. This is a privately financed publication which reports and interprets the work of the United Nations and which is widely distributed within foreign countries as well as the United States. Dolivet's position in the United Nations World is an unusually influential one in that he is allowed a very free hand in the determination of editorial policy and content. His position with the United Nations is reported to be as consultant with that part of the UN Secretariat which is concerned with publications and informational handbooks. Because of Dolivet's position as noted above and his connection in the United States and abroad, he is in a position to do a considerable amount of harm to the interests of the United States and would be able to wage a skillful and effective campaign from within our borders which can have far-reaching effects. Certain articles which have appeared recently in the United Nations World are regarded as containing dangerous distortions of the truth and to be very misleading to world public opinion. At least one of these articles on the so-called Gromyko plan was the subject of extensive comment and publication in important newspapers both here and abroad.

A certain State Department official described Dolivet as a very dangerous Stalinist agent and a member of the international Communist apparatus Witness No. 8, when testifying before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on July 23, 1949, described Louis Dolivet, previously a Rumanian citizen, presently international editor of United Nations World, as a liaison of the Communists with the United Nations Secretariat. Witness No. 8 also testified that all the archives and papers of the Secretariat were accessible to Mr. Dolivet.

Perhaps it is only coincidence that one of Mr. Dolivet's character witnesses is listed as Jackson Leighton, assistant publisher, and that Jackson Leighton is listed in 1950 as executive director of United Nations World.

I am presenting herewith a translation of an article from the French magazine, *La Revue Parlementaire*, dated December 15, 1949, which gives an excellent account of Dolivet's earlier pro-Soviet activities, written by a man whose integrity has been vouched for to me. Much of the material the article contains has been checked and verified. In particular, his connection with the late Willy Muenzenberg, the former German Communist with whom Dolivet worked in France during the late thirties, has been well documented with material from several different sources:

I have had the occasion of knowing personally one of these agents in Paris, especially in 1933. He was a native of Rumania, Ludwig Brecher, who at that time called himself Udeanu, and who finally became, in his most recent incarnation, M. Louis Dolivet.

I was at that time editor of *Monde*, the weekly published by Henri Barbusse, and I



endeavored to prevent the seizure of the paper by the French Communist Party. Unfortunately, my colleagues of the editorial board and I only had our pens at our service. Thus the French Communist Party succeeded in its attempt; we had to leave the paper, which survived our departure by only a few months, for in the process of changing its orientation it very quickly lost all its readers. The principal instrument of this suppression of an independent paper, which refused to obey the Communists, was M. Udeanu-Brecher-Dolivet. He planted himself in the printing plant and pretended to exercise a censorship over our articles by eliminating all which could harm the U. S. S. R. and finally he succeeded in eliminating all the rebels.

Udeanu-Dolivet, who began his political career at Geneva in the pro-Soviet socialist circles of M. Leon Nicole, participated successfully in the organization of the antiwar congress at Amsterdam (August 1932), in the similar movement at Amsterdam-Pleyel (1933), in the World Committee for the Struggle Against War and Fascism, and finally in 1935 in the Universal Rally for Peace (RVP—Reassemblément Universel pour la Paix), all party undertakings with Communist cadres, led by those Communist agents who, behind the scenes, pulled all the strings after being certain of the competition of the nobles, bishops, ministers, former ministers or those aspiring to be ministers, and writers in search of new emotions, which were designated as recruiting sergeants by Moscow.

There was not one of these projects in which Udeanu-Dolivet did not play a part. His superior in this technique was Willy Münzenberg, at the time when the latter, who had left Germany after the coming of Hitler to power, was transferred to France. To be exact, at this time Münzenberg was still in complete accord with Moscow, with whom he broke in the end, especially after the Russian-German Pact (1939). A trip to Russia at the end of 1934 presented Udeanu-Dolivet with an occasion to make direct contact with Soviet circles. It was about this time or a little after that Udeanu met, by being close to Münzenberg, the Swedish banker Olaf Ashberg, who had for a long time been a very active financial agent of the Soviets. Ashberg in his memoirs, which appeared in Stockholm in 1946, named Udeanu-Dolivet and published his photograph, which leaves no doubt as to his identification.

In 1934-35 Udeanu-Dolivet wrote several articles in the organ of World Committees for the Struggle, etc., which was called World Front. In his articles the author interpreted all about the principal idea: The defense of the Soviet Union at any price. For the defense he invoked the masses in all countries, which should impose the Soviet foreign policy on their respective governments. In direct connection with the line of the French Communist Party and with its successive changes, he came out against the extension of French military service to 2 years in March 1935; this law required by the merchants of death—and in his opinion it was easier to fight against war than it was in 1914, since at the present time there is the Soviet Union, the bulwark of the policy for peace. He denounced with indignation American finance capital which under the pretext of neutrality wishes to bring off the same activities and for the same beneficiaries that it did during the First World War.

These citations could be added to, but it is not worth the trouble. Udeanu-Dolivet had a few difficulties in 1937-38, following allegations of embezzlement of funds in the RVP and in the subscriptions for Spain. One of his most implacable accusers was Francis Jourdain. Udeanu-Dolivet's administration was in any case extremely confused; in such matters he was the personification of dis-

order. He became a naturalized Frenchman in 1937 under the Popular Front; he was designated a sergeant in the Ministry of Air, where his great friend, Pierre Cot, had retained many connections. After the debacle, he embarked at Marseille for America, which permitted him to save his position as well as his skin.

He found there his old friend the banker, Ashberg, and also Pierre Cot, and founded with him a magazine, Free World, which finally became United Nations World, whose pro-Soviet leanings are the same as Tribune des Nations, which appears at Paris. Udeanu-Dolivet has been with Pierre Cot (always Pierre Cot), one of the sponsors in France of Henry Wallace, the exploitation of whom by the French Communist Party is remembered.

This article is signed by A. Rossi.

Questions which raise themselves about this petitioner seem to be:

Why was there such a lag in time between his Army service in 1943 and his petition for citizenship in 1946?

What is the reason no hearing has been held on his petition these last 4 years, since under section 701 it could be held immediately and heard in any court having naturalization jurisdiction?

Why has the credibility of his witnesses not been investigated?

Since he always traveled under temporary visitor's visas, or more recently with diplomatic status, does any Federal authority know when this petitioner comes or goes? Or where?

How does an alien in this country on a temporary visitor's visa take a job such as Dolivet did when he was coeditor and secretary general of Free World in 1942?

Who and what is behind all these obviously special privileges granted Dolivet?

Was not Dolivet named by Alger Hiss in his letter to Noel Field as the man who would be interested in publishing Field's reports on eastern Europe?

Has the Communist record of Louis Dolivet, also known as Ludwig Brecher, been investigated? Is it known to the State Department?

Who recommended him to his present post with the United Nations?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENISON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. First I want to say that the gentleman from Illinois is making a very fine statement on this individual. This case ought to have the attention of the FBI, and certainly the State Department. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us how this man got into the Army and out of the Army in such a short time.

Mr. JENISON. I will be very happy to say to my colleague from Wisconsin that that is one of the first questions that occurs to one in investigating a case of this sort, and to date there has been a very large and ominous note of silence from the agencies involved as to that incident.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is not that information available in the Adjutant General's office?

Mr. JENISON. It is available there, as it should be, but it has not been revealed to us.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman made inquiry?

Mr. JENISON. We have made inquiry and we have been advised that it is confidential and cannot be released to us.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I understand that he is still an alien, and yet has free access to move about the United States by virtue of his identification with the United Nations Organization.

Mr. JENISON. I might say to my colleague from Wisconsin, not only does he have that privilege but he has access to such information as ought to be in a classified status and is available to him, apparently, when it is not available to the representatives of the people of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. His application for citizenship was based upon a special regulation for one who has been in the service; is that true?

Mr. JENISON. His application seems to be based on the fact that he served in the United States forces, even though that service was of less than 30 days' duration.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. He was inducted in October and discharged in November.

Mr. JENISON. Some 25 days later, and with no explanation whatsoever. I think perhaps the GI's of the Nation would be very much interested in knowing how some men can get out of the service in 25 days when others were required to spend 3 and 4 years fighting the battles of their country all over the world.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENISON. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman has made a very fine presentation. If this man was in the Army for only 25 days, I do not know of any law that would qualify him for any sort of preference as a veteran or member of the armed services. To the best of my recollection, you have to serve at least 90 days before you are entitled to any preference or benefits under any law we have enacted here in the Congress.

Mr. JENISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. Would that apply also to the particular law that gives this man preference in applying for citizenship?

Mr. JENISON. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for raising that question, for I have raised the same question, and section 701 does not specify a definite time of service.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman made inquiry about that?

Mr. JENISON. We have pursued this investigation through every source available.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. They actually do not give you much information, do they?

Mr. JENISON. It boils down to that. There is a black cloud of silence hovering over every agency that might give us information about this particular case, and I think my colleagues should know why we have not had any answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell us anything about Dolivet's alleged Communist affiliations? Has he been identified, for instance, with certain cells or groups who have been charged as being communistic?

Mr. JENISON. The record of this particular individual, I might say, is replete with affiliations dating back as far as 1933. They have been documented by sources of unquestioned integrity. I have included in the RECORD, with the permission of the House, a translation of an article appearing in a current French magazine, dated December 15, 1949, which gives a complete account of his earlier pro-Soviet activities, written by a man whose integrity has been vouched for to me.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Has the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House had this information?

Mr. JENISON. I am unable to answer that question, but it is my intention to turn this information over to the House Committee on Un-American Activities with the hope that that body may succeed where individuals up to date have failed.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I hope the gentleman does that. I want to compliment him again on bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. JENISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENISON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell us again what position this gentleman holds, and by what authority?

Mr. JENISON. Apparently the UN confirmed his request for diplomatic status, but we do not know his exact position; but the other position he now holds is international editor of the magazine that is now used as a publicity soundingboard for the United Nations and spread throughout not only this country but the world, as accounting for the activities of the United Nations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is he an agent or officer of the United Nations, or does he work under their direction?

Mr. JENISON. He has a diplomatic connection with the United Nations. I am unable to say whether he is an employee of the United Nations. That is one of the questions I should like to have the House Committee on Un-American Activities pursue further.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Where does he get his money, if he gets any?

Mr. JENISON. That would be a very interesting question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means he has not been able to discover that?

Mr. JENISON. I have not been able to discover the source of his salary as

such. I suspect very much it is the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does he work out of this United Nations city or territory up here in New York?

Mr. JENISON. I am advised that they work physically on the site of the offices of the United Nations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is a little territory within our country?

Mr. JENISON. The little world within the world in New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENISON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this serious matter to the attention of the Members of the House. Do I understand from the gentleman that these facts and this record of the man the gentleman is describing here have been brought to the attention of our Department of Defense by the gentleman or someone else?

Mr. JENISON. They have been brought to the attention of the Bureau of Immigration, and they have been brought to the attention of the State Department.

Mr. KEATING. From neither the Department of State nor the Bureau of Immigration has the gentleman been able to get any information of a substantial character about what is going on with regard to this?

Mr. JENISON. We have been unable to obtain any information as to why there has been delay and delay and delay in acting on this case, in which there is so much evidence to indicate that matters adversely affecting the Nation may be at stake.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will permit an observation, when this matter was called to my attention I made inquiry of the State Department and after waiting at least 3 weeks was informed indirectly that this was a highly secretive matter, a matter that the FBI was working on. I was referred to the FBI. I then contacted the FBI, and they said, "Strange; we don't know about it," except that he had an application on file for citizenship.

There is something funny between State and the FBI on this.

Mr. JENISON. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin for his help to me in trying to run down this matter and to confirm the observation he has made of the silence—the ominous silence on the whole matter, on the part of departments that should have this whole thing at their fingertips.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENISON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this the situation, then, that while on yesterday we passed a law requiring the registration of all the young men of the land, so that they would be available for military service, and while other branches of the Government are, you might say, mobilizing our industry and our resources, that this man is in this country having previously had connec-

tion with or been working for the Communists and is permitted to remain here in a position where he can get information as to what we are doing in preparing for any aggression that Russia might bring about?

Mr. JENISON. The gentleman is exactly correct. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not that seem a rather strange position for our Government to take—to draft or get ready to draft young men everywhere and send them everywhere in the world to fight and then right here at home in New York, to let this man who has a record of affiliations with the Communists stay here and know what we are trying to do in our plans?

Mr. JENISON. It is most discouraging. It should result in our revitalized effort to protect our own people here at home.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. This man has also been using a number of different names, has he not? How many different names has he used since he has been here?

Mr. JENISON. To date I have documentary proof of only two. But the difficulty of trailing a person through his activities on the European scene from the period from 1930 to 1940 gives sound basis for suspicion that there may be others.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENISON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Can the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from Wisconsin, who also apparently is somewhat familiar with this case, tell us whether this man is now here under some diplomatic immunity? Did I understand the gentleman to say that?

Mr. JENISON. The situation is that he came here under a temporary visa which seems to have been renewed and renewed, and then, upon application for citizenship, the whole matter has been frozen in silence.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman somewhere in the course of his remarks spoke of some diplomatic immunity.

Mr. JENISON. The diplomatic immunity seems to come from his association with his present activities with the United Nations. I challenge its legality, but I concede its effectiveness.

Mr. KEATING. Apparently, it is effective, whatever the nature of that relationship is, but I wondered whether the Department of State was also silent upon the existence of this diplomatic privilege or whether that question has been addressed to them at all.

Mr. JENISON. Let us say that the Department of State has been silent—period. And it is to call it to their attention in public and to bring the matter before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to advise my colleagues of the rather serious nature of this individual case that I have taken this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it correct to assume, then, that this man who is suspected, and with good reason, of working for the Communists is here because either the immigration authori-



ties or the Department of State do not oust him?

Mr. JENISON. That is certainly a statement of fact—he is here and has not been ousted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then what that amounts to is that either the Department of State or the Immigration Authorities are protecting him and keeping him here.

Mr. JENISON. He most certainly has been kept here, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My constituents write me from week to week and they say, "Here is a man who you say is a Communist, or unfit or unpatriotic and is engaged in subversive activities. Why do you not get rid of him?"

Now, what can I answer them? I have to say, "Well, the administration or some one of the executive departments is keeping him here." What can I do? I have to say something. Then they say, "We are not going to send you down to Congress unless you get rid of these subversive boys."

Mr. JENISON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, acknowledging his greater capacity to answer his own question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I tell them that they will have to get a new President, or a completely new executive branch of the government, with new department heads. That is the only thing I can tell them.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some other material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELIOTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7635. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to provide graduation leave upon appointment as commissioned officers in the Regular components of the Armed Forces of graduates of the United States Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies; and

H. J. Res. 476. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys and assistants employed by the Subcommittee on Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate in connection with the study ordered by Senate Resolution 219, Eighty-first Congress, second session.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 29, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1476. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1477. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish two additional offices of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and office of an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia: H. R. 8578. A bill authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system; without amendment (Rept. No. 2133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Everard Hadfield; without amendment (Rept. No. 2126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5016. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Dalla Rosa Prati and her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati; with amendment (Rept. No. 2127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5470. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Haddad; with amendment (Rept. No. 2128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7812. A bill for the relief of Martha Aporta Strickland; without amendment (Rept. No. 2129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 977. An act for the relief of Jacques Yedid, Henriette Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid; without amendment (Rept. No. 2130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1693. An act for the relief of Karin Margareta Hellen and Olof Christer Hellen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2156. An act for the relief of Sister Edel-

trudis Clara Weskamp; without amendment (Rept. No. 2132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 404. An act for the relief of Emma L. Jackson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 784. An act for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore; with amendment (Rept. No. 2136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5849. A bill for the relief of Samuel M. Kornegay; without amendment (Rept. No. 2137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5960. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogue; without amendment (Rept. No. 2138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7253. A bill for the relief of Charles Wilson Roland and Mirtle L. Roland; with amendment (Rept. No. 2139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7944. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Chandler; without amendment (Rept. No. 2140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8519. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archer C. Gunter; with amendment (Rept. No. 2141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TABER:  
H. R. 8642. A bill to amend Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TABER (by request):  
H. R. 8643. A bill to amend section 207, title II, part 1, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:  
H. R. 8644. A bill to assist the States in establishing and maintaining recreation day centers for older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:  
H. R. 8645. A bill to authorize and expedite the construction of family quarters needed at permanent military installations by authorizing the Secretaries of the military departments to contract for the construction of family quarters and to apply the occupants' basic allowances for quarters to the payment of the cost of construction provided that no monthly payment for any unit shall be less than \$75, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE:  
H. R. 8646. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that such act shall be centrally administered; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8647. A bill to establish an Inter-agency Hospital Commission for the promotion of efficiency and economy in the operation of hospitals of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 8648. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow deduction of certain premiums paid for life and fire insurance in computing income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 8649. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 8650. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 8651. A bill granting compensation to certain disabled employees of draft boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution extending the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 617. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 8652. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Ogawa Tapper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 8653. A bill for the relief of Fumie Kawamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8654. A bill for the relief of Antranik Hovsepian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 8655. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Kikyo and Francis Kikyo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the brooding silence of this still moment, may open windows of faith flood our gloom with light, that in Thy sunshine's blaze our day may brighter, fairer be. Even as we come to the altar of prayer our minds are plagued with questions we cannot answer, as to how humanity, with the dread secrets of nature in its fumbling hands, can live on this planet in peace and security. O God, the answers for which we gropingly seek in the darkness of our own devices are hidden in Thy heart.

Give us, we pray Thee, inner greatness of spirit and clearness of vision to meet

and match the large designs of this demanding day, that even amid the tensions of human relationships we may keep step with the drumbeat of Thy truth which is marching on. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 25, 1950, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 25, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

- S. 1145. An act for the relief of Persephone Poulos;
- S. 2071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth;
- S. 2258. An act for the relief of Dr. Apostoles A. Kartsonis;
- S. 2308. An act for the relief of William Alfred Bevan;
- S. 2427. An act for the relief of Masae Marumeto;
- S. 2431. An act for the relief of Sumike Kato;
- S. 2443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgetown Pensard;
- S. 2568. An act for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon; and
- S. 3122. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5990. An act to provide for the construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland and its extension into the District of Columbia as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and other purposes;

H. R. 6278. An act to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7623. An act relating to members of the District Boxing Commission who are retired members of the Metropolitan Police Department;

H. R. 7662. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944;

H. R. 7695. An act to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; and

H. R. 8578. An act authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LONG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Thursday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from the close of today's session until June 2 at possibly 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Holland	Myers
Benton	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Ives	O'Connor
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Kem	Russell
Chapman	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Darby	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Lehman	Sparkman
Douglas	McCarran	Stennis
Dworschak	McCarthy	Taft
Eastland	McClellan	Taylor
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McKellar	Thye
Ferguson	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
George	Malone	Wherry
Gillette	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Millikin	Withers
Hill	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations investigating the security program of the Department of State and its foreign establishments.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.